Disclaimer for Rough Real-Time Transcripts

"Do not quote or rely on this uncorrected transcript without obtaining written permission from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights at: transcripts@usccr.gov."

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

BUSINESS MEETING UNEDITED/UNOFFICAL

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, MARCH 16, 2018

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Suite 1150 at 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. at 9:00 a.m., Catherine E. Lhamon, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

CATHERINE E. LHAMON, Chair

PATRICIA TIMMONS-GOODSON, Vice Chair

DEBO P. ADEGBILE, Commissioner

GAIL HERIOT, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner*

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner*

MAURO MORALES, Staff Director

* Present via telephone

STAFF PRESENT:

PAMELA DUNSTON, Chief, ASCD

KATHERINE CULLITON-GONZALES

LATRICE FOSHEE

ALFREDA GREENE

DAVID MUSSATT

LENORE OSTROWSKY

MICHELE RAMEY

SARALE SEWELL

BRIAN WALCH

MARIK XAVIER-BRIER

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

SHERYL COZART

JASON LAGRIA

CARISSA MULDER

AMY ROYCE

RUKKU SINGLA

ALISON SOMIN

IRENA VIDULOVIC

CONTENTS

I.	APPROVAL OF AGENDA6
II.	BUSINESS MEETING Presentation from Maine Advisory Committee member Rachel Talbot Ross on the Committee's Advisory Memorandum on Racial Discriminations In Criminal Prosecution and Sentencing in Maine
	Presentation from Maryland Advisory Committee Chair Tom Mackall on the Committee's Advisory Memorandum on Fees and Fines and Bail Reform in Maryland
	Presentation from Illinois Advisory Committee Chair Juan Carlos Linares on the Committee's Report Civil Rights and Voting in Illinois
	Discussion and Vote on Timeline Discovery Plan and Outline for Commission Project, "In the Name of Hate: Examining the Federal Government's Role in Preventing Hate Crimes"
	Discussion on the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Highlights the Need for the Department of Justice to Reopen the Office for Access to Justice43
<	Discussion on the Environmental Protection Agency and its decision Regarding Uniontown, Alabama51
	Commemoration of Women's History Month Page Harrington, Historian and Preservationist61
	Fatima Goss Graves, President and CEO. National Women's Law Center

CONTENTS

	Statement about the White House's Budget
	Request for Fiscal Year '19111
	Letter from Commission to Thomas Homan Regarding Immigration Enforcement Actions in Court Houses122
	H. Management and Operations Staff Director's Report128
III.	ADJOURN MEETING

P R O C E E D I N G S

2	10:01 a.m.
3	CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Good morning. This
4	meeting of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights comes
5	to order at 10:00 a.m. on March 16, 2018.
6	The meeting takes place at the
7	Commission's Headquarters located at 1331 Pennsylvania
8	Avenue, Northwest in Washington, D.C.
9	I'm Chair Catherine Lhamon. And,
10	Commissioners who are present at this meeting, in
11	addition to me, are the Vice Chair, Patricia Timmons-
12	Goodson, Commissioner Heriot, Commissioner Adegbile.
13	On the phone, if you could confirm you're
14	on the line after I say your name, I believe we have
15	Commissioner Yaki.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Hi.
17	CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Thank you.
18	Commissioner Kirsanow?
19	(NO RESPONSE)
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. We do have a quorum
21	present. Is the court reporter present?
22	COURT REPORTER: Yes.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
24	Is the staff director present?
25	MR. MORALES: Yes.

1	I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
3	The meeting now comes to order.
4	So, a motion to approve the agenda for
5	this business meeting?
6	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: So moved.
7	CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Thank you.
8	Is there a second?
9	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Second.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
11	And, looking for amendments, I do have a
12	few to start us off.
13	First, I'll move to amend consideration
14	for a statement related to the Fiscal Year 2019
15	Proposed Budget.
16	Are there any other amendments?
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Commissioner Yaki
18	here.
19	CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Yes?
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have two amendments.
21	One is a potential letter to regarding the
22	immigration enforcement actions around courthouses.
23	The second is a statement regarding the
24	EPA [Environmental Protection Agency] decision on
25	Uniontown, Alabama.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, thank you.
2	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Madam Chair?
3	Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson.
4	I would move to amend it to include a
5	statement regarding the Commission highlighting the
6	need for the Department of Justice to reopen the
7	Office of Access to Justice.
8	CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Thank you.
9	Are there any other amendments?
10	Okay, I second the motion to amend for the
11	amendments that I didn't offer. Is there a second for
12	mine?
13	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Vice Chair
14	Timmons-Goodson, I second.
15	CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Thank you.
16	Let's vote to approve the agenda as
17	amended. All those in favor say aye.
18	(CHORUS OF AYES)
19	CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Any opposed?
20	(NO RESPONSE)
21	CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Any abstentions?
22	(NO RESPONSE)
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, the motion passes
24	unanimously.
25	II. BUSINESS MEETING
I	1

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, first, we will hear
2	some presentations from State Advisory Committee
3	members. Our first presentation will be from Rachel
4	Talbot Ross, a member of our main Advisory Committee,
5	on the Committee's recently released Advisory
6	Memorandum on Racial Discrimination in Criminal
7	Prosecution and Sentencing in Maine.
8	Ms. Ross, you have the floor.
9	PRESENTATION FROM MAINE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER
10	RACHEL TALBOT ROSS ON THE COMMITTEE'S ADVISORY
11	MEMORANDUM ON RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN CRIMINAL
12	PROSECUTION AND SENTENCING IN MAINE
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Ms. Ross, if you are
14	speaking, you're on mute.
15	(NO RESPONSE)
16	CHAIR LHAMON: And, if you're not, I think
17	we'll move on, if Ms. Ross joins us, we can come back
18	to her.
19	We'll instead hear from our Maryland
20	Advisory Committee Chair, Tom Mackall, on the
21	Committee's recently released Advisory Memorandum on
22	Fees and Fines and Bail Reform in Maryland.
23	Chair Mackall?
24	PRESENTATION FROM MARYLAND ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIR,
25	TOM MACKALL, ON THE COMMITTEE'S ADVISORY MEMORANDUM

ON FEES AND FINES AND BAIL REFORM IN MARYLAND

MR. MACKALL: Hello? Can you hear me? CHAIRMAN LHAMON: We can, thank you.

MR. MACKALL: Great.

Well, thank you, thank you for having me. And, thank you all for the work that you do.

I am here today to talk about the Maryland Advisory Committee's Advisory Memorandum specifically addressing Maryland -- whether Maryland or its local jurisdictions use court-imposed financial penalties and money bail in ways that may violate the Constitutional rights of persons assessed or otherwise interfere with the administration of justice.

Before I proceed, I would like to just sort of give you -- before I proceed to address the findings, I would just like very quickly to say that, there were a couple of things that happened that brought this to our attention.

The Dear Colleague letter that came from the Department of Justice, which is referenced in the memorandum, the letter from the Maryland Attorney General regarding money bail, which is also referenced in the memorandum, and an earlier study by the Brennan Center concerning the use of parole supervisory fees in Maryland and its impact as a barrier for re-entry

1 to society for people subject to those fees. 2 This particular topic was championed by a member of the Committee, Ms. Pamela Bennet. 3 I would 4 like specifically to thank her for her leadership on this effort. 5 And also, would like to particularly call 6 7 out and thank Barbara Delaviez for her support, quidance and energy that helped the Committee get to 8 9 the point that it did. 10 through don't want all to go you all have seen 11 findings because I believe that 12 I would like to simply emphasize the following. 13 information Where does exist, information raises concerns about the racially and 14 15 economic disparate impact of Maryland's system of fees 16 and fines and money bail, and its overall impact on 17 the administration of justice. And, when we had the public briefing, and 18 19 the testimony that we received support concerns, for 20 example, that were raised in the Brennan report 21 several years ago. That's just one example. 22 When we dug into this topic, however, I 23 think the primary concern that we encountered, and

recommendation going forward, is that we do not have

for

the

most

probably

the

basis

24

25

significant

in Maryland today any systematic or verifiable collection of information pertaining to the impact of the system of fines and fees and the money bail practices and the extent to which they result in incarceration, let alone the expense to which they may have a disparate impact on certain groups.

There is no uniform reporting system. There is no data regarding bail and pre-trial detentions on the outcomes of trials. There is no real data regarding bail bondsmen's uses of extra judicial remedies for collecting bail.

And, there simply is no systematic, verifiable information that is captured today in the State of Maryland that allows us to assess the extent to which these practices may result in incarceration whether disparate or not.

That lack of information is -- was for us, really a primary impediment to pursuing this project any further at this time.

And, if there is a concrete recommendation that comes out of this particular memorandum, it is most importantly that Maryland should address and begin to collect in a systematic and verifiable way: what is the practice regarding fees and fines around the State of Maryland?

1 And, what is the extent to which those 2 monetary penalties do result in incarceration? And, to what extent does the money -- do 3 4 the money bail practices and pre-trial detention that 5 exists today, what extent do they have an impact on judicial outcomes? 6 7 There have been some change with respect to the Maryland laws regarding money bail where judges 8 9 are expected to take into account the defendant's 10 ability to pay as they go forward And, perhaps, as that system is in place, 11 12 some information will come to light that may bear 13 reexamination of this. But, this lack of information, 14 critical issue and needs to be think, is a 15 addressed. 16 And, if that information is collected at 17 some point and becomes available to the public, we 18 believe this would be a very fertile topic for the 19 Committee to take up yet again. 20 CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks very much, Chair 21 Mackall. 22 I want to open it up for questions from my 23 fellow Commissioners. 24 Vice Chair? 25 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes, thank

1 so very much for this memorandum. And, 2 understand very clearly that your effort to look into this matter was impeded by the lack of information. 3 4 My inquiry is whether the fact that you 5 have put this out, is there any indication that you have had a positive effect in that there is proposed 6 7 legislation? Or, perhaps I should say, 8 is there 9 legislation out in any proposed there state 10 condition that would take care of the concern that you 11 have? 12 MR. MACKALL: Thank you for the question. 13 The short answer is, not that I'm aware of So, I cannot answer that definitively. 14 at this point. 15 What I can say to you is that one of our 16 witnesses did say that he believed that the judiciary 17 could pull that information together and would pull 18 that information together if directed to do so. 19 But, what is clear is, even if they did 20 so, it would not be done in a verifiable and auditable 21 fashion. So, while I can't say that there's any 22 legislation out there at this point, certainly, that 23 would be an outcome that we would welcome following 24 from this project.

VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON:

25

Thank you.

1 CHAIR LHAMON: Chair Mackall, this 2 Catherine Lhamon. I need to say to you as a fellow Marylander, thank you for your service and also for 3 4 taking up a topic that's obviously very important to 5 the state and to the country and also important to this Commission as a topic that we issued a report on 6 7 last September. I want to follow up on the Vice 8 9 question to you. I understand that you're not aware 10 of pending progress now to address the data collection 11 issue that was such an impediment to your analysis, 12 and obviously, as an impediment for the state. 13 I wonder what steps the State Advisory 14 Committee itself is taking to try to see change in 15 this area? It's obviously an area that has been ripe 16 in for change the state, given the state's recent 17 progress during the pendency of your investigation. 18 So, I'm interested in the steps that you, 19 together as a Committee, plan to take or are taking 20 related to correcting this issue? MR. MACKALL: We have not defined at this 21 22 point any specific steps. I think we were -- we do 23 have a meeting scheduled later in the month of April. 24 And, perhaps, that's a topic that we will address as

part of that meeting as to whether there may be any

1 appropriate or viable steps that the Committee would 2 take. So, I will take your question actually as 3 4 a suggestion of a way that we might move forward a 5 little further on this topic. CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific. 6 7 This is Vice VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Chair Timmons-Goodson. 8 9 As another possible way that you could 10 proceed, given that you have identified that perhaps 11 the judges have access to that information, and while 12 it might not -- their collection of that information might not meet statistical, rules and all of that, 13 might that be a place that you could begin and perhaps 14 15 going to the judicial council, the state's judicial 16 council or something, asking them to voluntarily take 17 on such a responsibility. 18 Now, I can't -- I can almost promise you 19 that will not be something that that 20 voluntarily take up, but it does get -- it continues 21 the discussion of the issue. 22 And, many of us are calling upon our 23 judges to do more in this area. But, just 24 suggestion.

MR. MACKALL:

25

Yes, well, and thank you for

1	the suggestion. I will tell you that I will be very
2	frank with you that within the Committee, we had a
3	number of discussions of steps that would that we
4	could take next.
5	And, quite honestly, one challenge that we
6	have is how to most efficiently allocate our time for
7	what we believe would be the return on that time that
8	we invest.
9	I've just received two fine suggestions
10	from the Commission, and I appreciate it. And, these
11	will be topics that we will put into the discussion as
12	we go forward.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks very much.
14	Are there any other questions from the
15	Commission?
16	(NO RESPONSE)
17	CHAIR LHAMON: With that, Chair Mackall,
18	we really appreciate your presentation.
19	I want to note, I believe that
20	Commissioner Kirsanow has joined us. Could you
21	confirm, Commissioner Kirsanow, that you're on the
22	phone?
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I am, thank you.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific, welcome.
25	And, I also understand that our Maine

1	Advisory Committee member, Rachel Talbot Ross has
2	called in. Ms. Ross, are you on the phone?
3	MS. ROSS: I am, thank you.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific, thank you.
5	We would welcome hearing your presentation
6	on your Advisory Memorandum on Racial Discrimination
7	and Criminal Prosecution Sentencing in Maine.
8	PRESENTATION FROM MAINE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER
9	RACHEL TALBOT ROSS ON THE COMMITTEE'S ADVISORY
10	MEMORANDUM ON RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN CRIMINAL
11	PROSECUTION AND SENTENCING IN MAINE
12	MS. ROSS: Well, I want to start by
13	thanking you for this opportunity to present what we
14	believe was a very critical investigation that, while
15	we had the hearing back in 2014, what's really
16	important to understand is the work that's taken place
17	as a result of the investigation and with your
18	support.
19	We've been able to move forward some of
20	the recommendations. So, I want to first start by
21	saying thank you for this opportunity.
22	I also have to just mention briefly that
23	I, at the time that the investigation and our hearing
24	was held, I was the Chair of the State Advisory

Committee. I am no longer the Chair, but am now

serving in the Maine state legislature and have been able to help move forward some of the recommendations from this group and serve on the Criminal Justice Committee for the House -- in the House of Representatives.

So, I'm really fortunate to be able to stay very close to the work and remain a member of the State Advisory Committee.

We, just briefly, the impetus for this work came from actually the local NAACP that had been working in the state. We have three branches in the state, one in the greater Bangor area, one in the Portland area and then, we uniquely have a branch of the NAACP in our maximum security prison, which is the Maine State Prison in Warren, Maine, which has been in place for well over 20 years.

So, the impetus for this work came from the NAACP. And, the NAACP, through the branch in the prison, was working on correctional policy and reform for years and started to see a theme coming out of some of the work, which was, these stories about convictions and what appeared to be disparate sentencing where the only common denominators seemed to be race, the race of the defendants which were all men of color predominantly and then the race of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 jury which were all white. 2 And so, it seeing and hearing the stories of these disparate sentencing where race was the only 3 4 common denominator, it led to a series of meetings 5 judicial branch, the Department Corrections and law enforcement in which the ACLU and 6 7 the Maine Prisoner Advisory Commission joined us. We held a series of meetings in order to 8 find out if we could do a pilot project that would 9 10 really help analyze what was going on with these 11 disparities. 12 The result of those meetings were that we 13 got connected to Cynthia Jones, who was one of the panel members who gave us the background in the 14 15 national context of a professor from the Washington 16 College of Law 17 started meeting with her and really 18 zeroed in on trying to examine the prosecutorial 19 decision making. 20 And, knowing that nationally, this was the 21 place in which the system would show the greatest 22 disparity. 23 Those meetings actually kind of -- the 24 pilot project never went on. And so, the Maine State

Advisory Commission picked up that work and held these

1 hearings. 2 As you can see, we had a quite good 3 diverse group of folks who joined us. One thing to 4 note of particular importance is that this hearing 5 included both formerly incarcerated folks, but we had the Board of a currently incarcerated person who 6 7 joined us for this hearing and truly made it one of the most unique hearings that we've ever had, 8 9 hear from people who were most -- or most impacted by 10 the situation. 11 who's still serving So, Brandon Brown, 12 time in Maine State Prison, he was the president of that branch and also Michael Parker, who was 13 founding President of that branch. So, that made the 14 15 hearing quite unique 16 $\Gamma'11$ just jump to the actions --17 CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Ms. Ross, the time for 18 presentation is over, but I appreciate presentation. 19 20 And, I'm going to move us --21 MS. ROSS: Okay. 22 CHAIRMAN LHAMON: -- questions from my 23 fellow Commissioners on the Advisory Memorandum. 24 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Again, 25 thank you for all of your work. But, you indicated

1 that, early on, that you had been able to make some 2 progress with regard to the recommendations or on this 3 issue. 4 I'd be interested in hearing more about 5 that. Thank you for the question, 6 MS. ROSS: 7 I'll make it -- try to make it brief. Two really substantial pieces have 8 9 forward as a result of this. 10 to close one of One is that we were able 11 our juvenile detention centers here in Maine and we're 12 on the verge of looking to close the last juvenile 13 detention center here in Maine, understanding that these are not the places for our youth, particularly 14 15 with such disparities for youth of color. 16 The ACLU, members of the Maine staff and 17 community action groups have really come 18 together to address juvenile justice issues in the 19 So, we're looking to close the last remaining 20 juvenile detention center in the state. 21 The second thing that we've done is we are 22 trying to re-engage the judiciary, corrections and law 23 enforcement in order to get data, comprehensive data, so that we can hold briefings with legislators. 24

It looks like we are going to be able to

1 re-engage those folks. 2 The Supreme Court Justice for the -- has indicated a willingness to try to launch that pilot 3 4 program, so we're really excited about that. 5 And, we have identified the Maine Muskie School of Public Service will do the analysis on that 6 7 data. The third piece is that we were able 8 9 introduce two bills in this legislative session that 10 were written by currently incarcerated men, to address 11 the issue of parole, not having parole in the State of 12 Maine. 13 a bill called Earned Time We introduce 14 which would, upon completion of a rehabilitation 15 program, it would give inmates addition time. 16 also introduced bill And, 17 rehabilitation that would put in statute the pathway 18 rehabilitation SO that we could address 19 reintegration and re-entry. 20 So, we've introduced legislation. We 21 helped closed down a juvenile detention center and 22 we've re-engaged the judiciary, corrections and law 23 enforcement on data collection. 24 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thank you. 25 CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Ms. Ross, the second to

1	the last bill that you mentioned that would address
2	reintegration and re-entry has particularly peaked my
3	interest because of pending investigation at the
4	Commission about the collateral consequences of
5	incarceration.
6	And, I would welcome information about the
7	status of that bill after this legislative session, if
8	you are able and willing to share with us.
9	MS. ROSS: Absolutely. I ve got to say
10	that we're so proud, and I don't know where else this
11	has happened, but we're really, really proud that in
12	this legislative session, we were able to introduce a
13	total of four bills that were written by currently
14	incarcerated men at the Maine State Prison.
15	And, the rehabilitation one, it's based on
16	a proposal that was written by currently incarcerated
17	men that we translated into a bill. That bill is now
18	working its way through the Maine State legislature.
19	And, I'd be more than pleased to keep you
20	updated on the status of that.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
22	Any other questions from fellow
23	Commissioners?
24	(NO RESPONSE)
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioners on the phone?

1	(NO RESPONSE)
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks so much, Ms. Ross.
3	We really appreciate your presentation and your work
4	on the Committee.
5	MS. ROSS: Thank you, I appreciate the
6	opportunity.
7	PRESENTATION FROM ILLINOIS ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIR,
8	JUAN CARLOS LINARES, ON THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT CIVIL
9	RIGHTS AND VOTING IN ILLINOIS
10	CHAIR LHAMON: We'll now hear from our
11	Illinois Advisory Committee Chair, Juan Carlos
12	Linares, on the Committee's report on civil rights and
13	voting in Illinois.
14	MR. LINARES: Good morning, can you hear
15	me?
16	CHAIRM LHAMON: We can, good morning.
17	MR. LINARES: Great, good morning. Thank
18	you so much for the opportunity. The Illinois
19	Advisory Committee also thanks you for this
20	opportunity to present.
21	And, special thanks also to David Mussatt
22	and Melissa Wojnaroski of our Chicago Office, who were
23	instrumental in facilitating this work for us over the
24	past couple of years.

I'm going to summarize then the impetus of

1 why we went ahead and worked on the issue of civil 2 rights as they pertain to voters in Illinois. 3 And then, I'll go over some of 4 findings for some of the sections that we pulled for 5 the report and then some recommendations. So, the impetus of our work with regards 6 7 to voting and civil rights really stemmed from the 2016 general election, the presidential election where 8 9 there was a lot of discussion, not just in the media, 10 but directly from the White House, really, 11 discuss whether we go ahead and research if there was 12 voter fraud, voters who were non-citizens who were 13 going to booths and voting And, we really found this as a compelling 14 15 issue in Illinois. 16 jump to one of the findings, we 17 if you have the report, there's a section on 18 voting rights in Illinois and we talked the specific 19 it pertains to the local jurisdictions in 20 Illinois. 21 And, just to jump to one of the findings 22 which addressed directly the impetus for our work, 23 from 2000 to 2014, there was found no fraud in voting 24 or voting from any illegal voting from non-citizens.

In fact, from some of the panelists, we

heard, there's a broad awareness of non-citizens who are hoping to become citizens, that voting is a deportable offense. So, we saw no fraud coming from the panelists.

At this point, let me pause to say that, given the partisan nature that voting rights and civil rights can take, we were very intentional about selecting a panel that would provide a balanced overview of these civil rights issues as they pertain to voting, and I'm confident in saying that we achieved that diversity and bipartisan nature of the panelists that we had.

We heard from folks in nonprofit service agencies. We heard from people in policy think tanks. We heard from government officials and from folks who are general residents and voters, including those who were formerly incarcerated.

So, to jump to a few more sections, then, we looked at a few content specific issues with regards to voting rights, one of which was voting access among jailed inmates or to the formerly incarcerated.

Now, this is specific -- this is -- was very important in Illinois, in that 56 percent of the incarcerated individuals in Illinois are African-

1 American, even though only 15 percent of the general 2 population is. So, there is this potential just on the 3 4 face of it to look at issues of disparate impact. 5 But, what we found was very compelling. Illinois is one of 14 states that allows 6 7 for voting automatically once the incarcerated have come out of being incarcerated. 8 So, that's 14 9 including the District of Columbia. 10 All that said, heard we 11 including from those who were formerly incarcerated, 12 that mentioned that there is not a lot of awareness 13 among prison jail officials for those who are not currently facing felony sentences, but those who are 14 merely jailed before their trials. 15 16 Those folks, too, have the right to vote, 17 there's Just not an awareness amongst 18 official, whether or how to operate these voting 19 rights. 20 Ι do say, since our panels want to 21 occurred, the Cook County Sheriff, and Cook County is 22 where Chicago sits, the Cook County Sheriff went ahead 23 and does a mass voting exercise for early voting 24 purposes with the jailed inmates for those who want to

participate.

1 There's also a lack of awareness with 2 regards to distributing absentee ballots in the jails 3 themselves. 4 One very compelling thing that we found 5 was with regards to what call 6 gerrymandering. 7 So, in one specific instance, there's a city called Pinckneyville in southern Illinois, where 8 9 that jurisdiction, there are more people in 10 incarcerated in that county than there are people 11 actually living in the county that not 12 incarcerated. 13 So, the issue there is with regards to representative power is that we are counting folks who 14 15 are prisoners as residents of that county even though 16 they are not allowed to vote because they're serving 17 felony sentences. 18 Mr. Linares, can you --CHAIR LHAMON: 19 MR. LINARES: So, that was one very 20 compelling --21 CHAIR LHAMON: Mr. Linares, just to -- I'm 22 sorry for interrupting, but just to pause for a 23 moment. 24 For folks who are on the line, if you are 25 not speaking, could you mute your lines? We're

1 hearing a little bit of feedback. 2 Thank you. Go ahead, Mr. Linares. 3 4 MR. LINARES: I appreciate that, I heard 5 that, too. So, just to jump to a few more sections 6 7 then to summarize and wrap up, we also looked at voting access for limited-English proficient voters. 8 9 There, specifically, there are some federal laws in 10 place including Sections 203 and 208 which you'll find 11 in the report. issues there are with regards to 12 Section 203 how we count individuals who need language 13 access on the ballots themselves. 14 Specifically, in 15 the city of Chicago, which is of one 16 jurisdictions which triggers the language access, we 17 have ballots in Spanish, in Chinese Mandarin and in 18 Hindi. 19 But, there are outlying counties where 20 that number trigger, either 10,000 individuals within 21 that jurisdiction or five percent of that jurisdiction 22 needing the language access, this will be an issue in 23 the next Census on how we count individuals. 24 And then, for Section 208, this gets into 25 the last section. So, it's a mixture of language

access issue where Section 208 mandates that folks that need assistance at the ballots themselves, can bring in someone to translate for them, someone who is not either their employer or a union steward.

But, the issue there goes with election judges. Election judges are often not trained enough to know what the rules are with regards to either bringing folks into translate for them or a variety of other issues.

This jumps to sections of the report on access for individuals with disabilities or the homeless who don't always have that permanent address but are doubled up and staying with someone else do have that address and may have to have different forms of identification, but the election judges aren't always aware.

So, jumping to some of the recommendations then that we found is, in order to ensure that the civil rights of voters are being met, the training of election judges is critical in facilitating the process of voting itself.

There's also issues that we found from some of our government officials that, when training election judges, there's not always enough money to do so and there's not always enough money to pay judges

so that we're getting the highest quality of folks that are willing to stay a 14-hour day to facilitate the ballot.

So, jumping to in other recommendations then, we did have a brief discussion on campaign finance. And, this is where I'll conclude with regards to the content piece, is we had some panel testimony with regards to those that donate under the Citizens United case where folks are -- candidates are free to receive amounts of money that aren't restricted under the Citizens United ruling.

So, but, what we found, particularly in the Chicago mayoral election, that 94 percent of the current mayor's funders were white individuals. And, many of those male as well. And, many of those upper income.

So, what we're finding then is a potential for policy to be drawn so that they're serving those donors and not necessarily the general public. This is something to be analyzed further, we think, under the Citizens United case and the results therein.

So, conclude then, again, we thank you for the time. There are in Illinois a variety of content issues related to civil rights with regards to voting, particularly disparate impact amongst African-

1	Americans and those who are incarcerated.
2	Also, access to the ballot with regards to
3	language, disability or housing status.
4	And, at the end of the day, campaign
5	finance being one of those that can perhaps see a
6	disparate impact on how policies are written.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Mr. Linares, thank you very
8	much for your presentation and please thank your
9	fellow Committee members for the thorough and very
10	comprehensive report on voting in Illinois. I really
11	appreciate it.
12	I want to open the floor for conversation
13	from my fellow Commissioners.
14	Commissioner Adegbile?
15	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Yes, hello.
16	I was wondering if you could give us a
17	little bit more of a flavor of how the implementation
18	of election-day registration has been going in
19	Illinois?
20	MR. LINARES: Thank you for asking that
21	question. So, what we found, when the panels were
22	being conducted, was the issue of automatic voter
23	registration was currently in our legislature and it
24	had not been passed.
25	But, since we've had our panel testimony

1 and since we've had drafts of the report going back 2 and forth, the Illinois governor did sign automatic voter registration into law on August 28, 2017. 3 4 And, what that says is, anytime you go to 5 renew your driver's license, you will be automatically be registered to vote if you're also a citizen of the 6 7 United States. We also have some law that says 8 9 you're automatically registered, but if you're a small 10 county, you can opt out. So, this leads to maybe some 11 disparate impact with regards to the smaller counties 12 where their election commissioners can opt out of this 13 law. Now, twenty of 120 counties guarantee this 14 15 by virtue of the size of their populations. 16 heard testimony from folks that, in the southern part 17 Illinois, it's not a quarantee to have 18 automatic voter registration. 19 So, this could bring up some issues with 20 regards to the fairness of and impacts with regards to 21 who gets to automatically register on election day. 22 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: And, I take it

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

administrability of election-day registration

something to

do

with

the

that

exclusion

smaller counties?

has

23

24

1 MR. LINARES: Yes, that's what we found. 2 And so, some of the counties can't fully staff their precincts or election jurisdiction with the numbers of 3 4 people to be able to administer this. The larger 5 counties more clearly can. But, the -- one of the issues becomes the 6 7 funding of this mandate is if we -- if the state is able to fund this, then there probably shouldn't be 9 this disparity. 10 But, these are all testimonies that we've 11 heard, the facts remain that 20 of 120 counties do 12 allow for election-day registration and the rest can 13 opt out. 14 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. 15 Linares, this is Catherine Lhamon. 16 found very compelling the window into the experiences 17 of voters and potential voters in your state that you 18 included in the report, including, for example, the 19 discussion about voter intimidation in Cook County 20 that you had included at page twenty. 21 So, thank you very much for making visible 22 to folks who are outside Illinois experiences of 23 people in Illinois. 24 I also was struck in the report about one 25 of the issues that the report raises with respect to

1 voting rights of formerly incarcerated individuals, 2 that even though Illinois automatically restores the voting rights, many individuals in this position are 3 not aware of the restoration, and that's an issue that 4 5 heard about when I visited the Alabama Advisory Committee's briefing, also on voting rights. 6 7 And, interested in whether your Committee considered a recommendation on this issue and how 8 9 current state of this information might be improved? 10 MR. LINARES: Yes, and thank you for your 11 And, actually both parts of your comments 12 are very much related into a culture of training, not just election judges, but all policy officials into 13 the voting rights in Illinois as they stand. 14 15 you mentioned, voter intimidation, as 16 there was one scenario in Cicero, Illinois, which is a 17 near west suburb of Chicago, where police officers 18 present at the polls and were demanding that 19 voters bring their permits, quote, unquote, permits 20 which are not really -- it's not a real thing, it's 21 not necessary to have a permit to vote. 22 So, that's one of the instances of voter 23 intimidation. But, again, it goes towards teaching not 24 25 just the election judges as to what the rules are, but

1 police officers, all government personnel and anyone 2 related to the voting system outright. We did hear from one individual who had 3 4 been incarcerated that he was told outright by the 5 local county jail official, that he could not vote. And so, and that was -- he thought not necessarily a 6 7 malicious statement so much as it was the jail -- the officer just wasn't really informed as to what 9 rules are and was just guessing and trying to keep 10 people quiet during that time period 11 question, So, your one the 12 recommendations that we want to informally put forward 13 is the better training of both, not just the election officials, but of all folks who work in government and 14 15 who work on policy. 16 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. 17 Commissioner Adegbile? 18 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Hi, I have one 19 question with respect to the automatic voter 20 registration effort in Illinois. 21 Is it the case that that effort is focused 22 only on DMVs as opposed to other agencies? 23 LINARES: So, thank you for your MR. 24 To answer your question, to my knowledge, 25 it is focused on the DMVs at the current moment.

1	But, I am aware of discussions of either
2	broadening that effort or further clarifying that.
3	But, to the extent that we heard
4	testimony, it is currently, yes, focused on the DMV.
5	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Because I take it
6	one consideration there is whether that approach
7	itself may have some disparate impact to the extent
8	that there may be disparities in people who hold
9	driver's licenses. And so, that may be something
10	worth further inquiry.
11	MR. LINARES: And, thank you for your
12	comment, because one of the findings in the report is
13	that individuals who earn less than \$35,000 a year,
14	which are more likely to be seniors, those with
15	disabilities, or people of color are less likely to
16	have either a driver's license of a state issued ID.
17	So, thank you for your comment, because that is
18	reflected in the report as well.
19	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thank you.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Any other questions from
21	Commissioners including Commissioners on the phone?
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair,
23	Kirsanow here.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you.

1	Thanks very much for your presentation, it
2	was very informative. You stated at the outset - I
3	think I may have misheard or didn't hear the entire
4	presentation- but I think you said that you didn't
5	find any evidence of voter fraud in Illinois?
6	MR. LINARES: That is correct, that's per
7	the findings of our panel discussion, yes.
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And, how did you
9	make that determination?
10	MR. LINARES: So, we had several
11	individuals, and we have the transcripts available,
12	too, I think publically available, so I can't quote
13	exactly who it was, but we had government officials
14	including those with Cook County Clerk's Office which
15	administers voting and those with the Chicago Board of
16	Elections.
17	And, I believe it was one of those
18	individuals that looked at the study on enforcement
19	and showed us that there was no finding of fraud in
20	Illinois from the years 2000 to 2014 or any evidence
21	of non-citizen voting during that time either.
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Oh, well, thank
23	you.
24	It may, in the future, if you look at this
25	again, be a good idea to look at some media reports
1	1

1	from CBS and Chicago Tribune that cite a number of
2	individuals who've been convicted of voter fraud,
3	including Mahmoud Vakili, an Iranian citizen who was
4	convicted and sentenced to prison for voting while he
5	was not eligible to vote; Steveland Kidd, who CBS says
6	was sentenced for voting fraudulently pursuant to
7	absentee ballot; Brian McDouglar three years in prison
8	for falsified absentee ballot; Audrey Cook, Augustus
9	Stacker, Pamela Boyd, Monica LaPlant.
10	Sometimes the media has information that
11	maybe Cook County doesn't.
12	MR. LINARES: And, I appreciate that
13	information and research. We will look into that.
14	And, again, we were relying on the government
15	officials that testified us. So, thank you for that
16	information.
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Any other questions?
19	(NO RESPONSE)
20	CHAIR LHAMON: What that, Mr. Linares,
21	thank you very much for your presentation and thank
22	you to each of the State Advisory Committee members
23	who took the time to present to us and for the work
24	that you've taken for your State Advisory Committees.

It's always a pleasure for us to be able to hear from

you and, as is reflected in the reports from today,
it's a pleasure to see the wide variety of issues that
the State Advisory Committees are taking up.
Thanks very much.
MR. LINARES: Thank you very much, thank
you.
DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON TIMELINE, DISCOVERY PLAN AND
OUTLINE FOR COMMISSION PROJECT, "IN THE NAME OF
HATE: EXAMINING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN
PREVENTING HATE CRIMES":
CHAIR LHAMON: The next item on our agenda
is discussion and vote on the time line discovery plan
and outline for our upcoming project for our May
briefing titled, "In the Name of Hate: Examining the
Federal Government's Role in Preventing Hate Crimes."
Federal Government's Role in Preventing Hate Crimes." Is there a motion so we can open the floor
Is there a motion so we can open the floor
Is there a motion so we can open the floor for discussion?
Is there a motion so we can open the floor for discussion? COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I so move.
Ts there a motion so we can open the floor for discussion? COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I so move. CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a second?
Ts there a motion so we can open the floor for discussion? COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I so move. CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a second? VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Second.
Ts there a motion so we can open the floor for discussion? COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I so move. CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a second? VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Second. CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Terrific, we'll not have
Ts there a motion so we can open the floor for discussion? COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I so move. CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a second? VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Second. CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Terrific, we'll not have a discussion on the motion.

1 Commissioners and Commissioner Special Assistance to 2 get to these final documents. Are there any other points for discussion 3 4 before we vote? 5 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Madam Chairman? CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot? 6 7 I know that both COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Commissioner Kirsanow and I have made the point that 8 9 this is too ambitious, that we've never been able to 10 pull off quite so much work in one of our reports. 11 And, we have recommended that the part 12 that's addressed to the Department of Education, which 13 is not a crime oriented area at all, would be best to 14 lead it. 15 action seems to have been taken on 16 I've assumed that the majority of that, SO 17 Commission is of the other view. 18 But, I did want to point out that I 19 predict that this is not going to be something that 20 our staff can handle and that we would be much better 21 off if, at the very least, we cut back on the part 22 that is related to bias incidents rather than hate 23 crimes since that's going to open a whole new can of 24 worms with First Amendment issues, with all sorts of

stuff.

1	So, I would, again, strongly urge that we
2	get rid of that part.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
4	The materials reflect the proposal that we
5	voted on as a Commission that included the Department
6	of Education. But, I appreciate your sustained view
7	on the topic, too.
8	Any other discussion?
9	(NO RESPONSE)
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay I'll call the
11	question, we can take a roll call vote.
12	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
13	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote no.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson?
21	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: And, I vote yes.
23	The motion passes, two Commissioners
24	opposed, no Commissioner abstained and all others were
25	in favor.

1 AMENDED BUSINESS ITEMS 2 DISCUSSION ON "THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS HIGHLIGHTS THE NEED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO 3 REOPEN THE OFFICE FOR ACCESS TO JUSTICE" 4 5 CHAIR LHAMON: We'll now consider our amended business items beginning with the statement on 6 7 the Department of Justice access to Justice Office. I'll turn it over to the Vice Chair 8 9 read the statement and, as is our customer, I take it 10 you omit the footnotes as you read so that we can move 11 forward expeditiously. COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, please. 12 13 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: I will omit 14 the footnotes. 15 The statement is entitled, "The 16 Commission on Civil Rights Highlights the Need for the 17 Department of Justice to Reopen the Office for Access 18 to Justice. 19 "The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights calls 20 on Attorney General Jeff Sessions to ensure the 21 Department of Justice's Office for Access to Justice 22 fully operational and able to perform its 23 functions. 24 The Office Safeguards Access to Justice on 25 behalf of people who cannot afford lawyers so that the

1 justice system delivers outcomes that are fair and 2 accessible to all, regardless of income. The Commission is concerned about reports 3 4 that the Attorney General has functionally closed the 5 office by reducing its staff and shifting resources elsewhere within the Department. 6 7 We call on Attorney General Sessions to immediately reconstitute the office with dedicated 8 9 staff and to rescind any efforts otherwise. 10 Since its inception in 2010, the office 11 worked within the Department across federal 12 agencies and with various stakeholders in an effort to focus the country's attention on the right to counsel. 13 To that end, the office has engaged in 14 15 filing a series of statements of interest and amicus 16 briefs related to Access to Justice issues, launched 17 an interagency collaboration and served as the U.S. 18 government's central authority on access to justice. 19 The work of the office was also critical 20 Commission's findings in informing the and 21 recommendations follow investigation our into 22 excessive fines and fees that target low income people 23 of color. 24 In the area of fines and fees, the office, 25 multiple times, convened policy makers, judges,

prosecutors, defense attorneys and advocates to discuss how certain practices with respect to the imposition and enforcement of fines and fees can result in unlawful and harmful conduct.

In addition, the office, along with the Department's Civil Rights Division, issued Dear Colleague Letters to state administrators and chief justices in each state to provide greater clarity to state and local courts regarding their legal obligations.

The Commission majority recognized that our report on fines and fees that these convenings and guidance letters influenced local and statewide reformed practice, increasing access to justice consistent with constitutional commands.

The Commission is concerned that the work of the office in convening stakeholders, issuing guidance, litigating noncompliance and serving as a central authority will end without dedicated staff. Ceasing that work risks ending, in practical terms, the mission of the Department of Justice itself for many millions of low income Americans.

Access to Justice is core to effective democracy and also a core component Congress has charged the Commission with safeguarding.

1	Thus, the Commission urges Attorney
2	General Sessions to immediately shift resources back
3	to the office and to rededicate the staff to the
4	important mission of Access to Justice.
5	Chair Catherine E. Lhamon stated, and I
6	quote, the Department of Justice disserves all
7	Americans by turning its back on Access to Justice for
8	those with the lowest income among us. We strongly
9	urge renewed immediate fidelity to the core justice
10	mission."
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Madam Vice
12	Chair.
13	Is there a motion so we can open the floor
14	for discussion? I'll move.
15	Is there a second?
16	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
18	Is there any discussion on this statement?
19	Commissioner Heriot?
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: This statement seems
21	to me to be premature. If we're actually interested
22	in whether the Department of Justice is, in fact,
23	doing what we what the statement seems to assume
24	that it's doing, the best way to do that is through a
25	letter, not by a press release of this sort.

1 And so, I would urge that this be recast 2 as a letter to the Department of Justice. 3 response that you get is not to your liking, you can 4 always do a press release. 5 But, it's a little hard to document as sincere given that it's not being phrased 6 7 It may well be that the Attorney as a question. General is shifting even more resources to this topic 8 9 just within the Civil Rights Division. 10 Division the Civil Rights 11 getting a modest increase in its budget this year, 12 even though the tasks that are assigned to the Civil 13 Rights Division are less now than what they were a few years ago because of the Shelby County decision by the 14 15 Supreme Court. 16 would urge that this be done as a 17 letter that's a true inquiry and not a press release 18 that's designed to cause the reader to assume what 19 facts that aren't yet in evidence. 20 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: I thank you 21 for that, Commissioner Heriot. And, I, too, gave that 22 some thought, but I'm of the opinion that time is of 23 the essence. 24 While we -- what we're hoping to do is to 25 have some effect on the decision itself and by --

1	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But, we don't know
2	what that decision was.
3	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: And, I'm
4	concerned that if we wait and it's done, then we've
5	lost whatever we could have done to have some say or
6	word out on the decision.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: My understanding, in
8	addition, is that we have engaged in substantial
9	efforts to find out the specific actions and that the
10	Department of Justice has not been forthcoming in its
11	words.
12	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But, not a letter.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: And, it is my view that it
14	is important for the Commission to fulfill its role to
15	Congress, to the President, to the American people in
16	addressing core civil rights issues as they come up in
17	a timely manner, in a way to try to influence their
18	operation.
19	So, I support issuing the statement now.
20	Any further discussion?
21	(NO RESPONSE)
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, I'll call the
23	question and take a roll call vote.
24	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
25	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Of course I vote no.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
4	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson?
8	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Of course I
9	vote yes.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes.
11	The motion fails because there were three
12	Commissioners opposed and three Commissioners in
13	favor.
14	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Okay, with it
15	having failed, might be appropriate, Madam Chair, that
16	I then offer this in terms of it going out as a letter
17	under your signature inquiring as Commissioner Heriot
18	has sought? It failed.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Yes, maybe we could
20	persuade Commissioner Heriot.
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm not used to
22	winning on this.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: You convinced Commissioner
24	Yaki to come along with you.
25	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Democracy in

1	action.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Hang on, hang on. I'm
3	sorry, I'm sorry, I'm going to move to change my vote
4	because I totally was not paying attention to what was
5	going on.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Were you, perhaps, confused
7	Commissioner Yaki, and you intended to vote yes?
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I was actually looking
9	at a statement by Commissioner Kirsanow on another
10	issues and I thought, no. So, I apologize.
11	Could I I'd like to change my vote to a
12	yes.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay.
14	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I have no objection
15	to that.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
17	But, we all appreciate your levity, so,
18	thank you for that today as well.
19	The motion therefore passes, two
20	Commissioners opposed, none abstained, all others were
21	in favor. So, thank you.
22	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thanks for that
23	experiment in democracy.
24	(LAUGHTER)
25	DISCUSSION ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACENCY

AND ITS DECISION REGARDING UNIONTOWN, ALABAMA

CHAIR LHAMON: And, let's see how do with our next statement. Let's now consider the statement about the Environment Protection Agency and its decision regarding Uniontown, Alabama.

I'll turn it over to Commissioner Yaki to read the statement, please.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I hope I won't voté no on my own thing.

(LAUGHTER)

COMMISSIONER YAKI: You know, so, Commissioners, this is an issue that this Commission actually, unfortunately, perhaps foresaw in its report last year, this is regarding the dismissal of the civil rights complaint made by the residents of Uniontown, Alabama from the coal ash deposits and this is what it states.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Statement regarding EPA decision on Uniontown, Alabama.

As an Agency that conducted its own fact finding on environmental justice enforcement from the Environmental Protection Agency, we express our deep concern over the EPA's recent decision to dismiss two Uniontown, Alabama civil rights investigations without violation findings.

1 Sadly, these dismissals continue the EPA 2 disturbing and longstanding track record which this Commission documented of not making a formal finding 3 4 of discrimination or denying or withdrawing financial 5 assistance from а recipient for civil violations. 6 7 After our investigation, which included meeting with and hearing from the affected residents 8 9 of the Uniontown community, the Commission found that 10 the EPA decision to allow the movement and storage of 11 coal ash in Uniontown did not fully consider the civil 12 rights impacts. We also found that storage of coal as in 13 adversely 14 Uniontown has impacted the surrounding 15 community. 16 latest decisions by These 17 perpetuate the environmental injustice the Uniontown 18 community must endure. 19 Environmental justice is a critical civil 20 right that helps address the negative health outcomes 21 in communities of color and low income communities who 22 disproportionately affected by environmental 23 pollution. We will continue to monitor the EPA's 24

enforcement of federal civil rights statutes and find

this is yet another distressing step in the wrong direction for the Agency.

The Commission's 2016 Statutory

Enforcement Report, "Environmental Justice, Toxic Materials, Poor Economies and the Impact on Environment of Low Income Minority Communities," examined the EPA's work under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 12898 with a the civil rights implications of on facilities placement of coal ash disposal income communities communities of color and low exactly like -- and I just editorialized that exactly -- like Uniontown, Alabama.

In addition to the briefings held by the Commission in Washington, D.C., two addition public -two additional meetings on topics were coordinated that year by the Commissions North Carolina and Illinois State Advisory Committees. Period.

End of statement.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.

And, whereas, we typically don't read the footnotes, there is only one in this one and it notes that both Commissioner Adegbile and I did not participate in this investigation because it occurred prior to our appointment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Thank you for reading it, Commissioner
2	Yaki.
3	We can now discuss the statement. Is
4	there a motion so we can open the floor for
5	discussion?
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I so move.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
8	Is there a second?
9	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Vice Chair
10	Timmons-Goodson, I second.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
12	Any discussion on this statement?
13	Commissioner Heriot?
14	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, I was a little
15	surprised by this statement. This is the case, I know
16	some of you were not on the Commission at the time,
17	this is the case where we had planned an investigation
18	to go down to Uniontown, Alabama, but it was abruptly
19	cancelled over my objections.
20	This is one of those cases where at least
21	one member of the Commission tried to have the General
22	Counsel's Office state that it would an ethical
23	violation for me to go down to Uniontown.
24	In the end, I was the only Commissioner to
25	go to Uniontown. It was very clear that some of what

1 we were told during the briefing here in Washington, 2 D.C. was incorrect. Frankly, I thought that report was one of 3 4 the Commission's greater embarrassments. 5 And so, I am very surprised given our level of expertise in this area, which is essentially 6 7 nil, that we would be questioning the EPA's findings. 8 CHAIR LHAMON: Any others? 9 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Commissioner Chair? 10 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki? 11 COMMISSIONER YAKI: We had two briefings 12 on this in Washington, D.C. North Carolina also held 13 issues on this. this is a pattern and practice by 14 15 the EPA Office Civil Rights through 16 administrations. This is not aimed at any single 17 administration, this is something that we have found 18 to be a distressing pattern, ongoing. 19 And, this confirms actually our findings 20 going forward. And, I will say that one of the great 21 things that came out, side benefits of our hearing on 22 voting rights in North Carolina is that we actually 23 met with some of the folks from Alabama who drove up 24 to talk about what an impact our hearing has had

positively for residents in the community.

1	And, I think that this is this
2	statement is amply warranted.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Any further discussion?
4	(NO RESPONSE)
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, I'll call the
6	question and take a roll call vote.
7	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
8	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson?
16	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: And, I vote yes.
18	The motion passes, two Commissioners
19	opposed, no Commissioner abstained, all others were in
20	favor.
21	COMMEMORATION OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH PAGE
22	HARRINGTON, HISTORIAN AND PRESERVATIONIST
23	CHAIR LHAMON: I see that we are just at
24	11:00 a.m. and we have our two scheduled speakers here
25	with us, so I'm going to table the discussion for the

1 of rest the business meeting to follow the 2 presentation from our two speakers and invite them to come to their places at the podium and we can being 3 4 our historical presentation. 5 Then, after that concludes, we'll return to the remainder of our business meeting. 6 7 So, as our two speakers are joining us, we are planning now to commemorate Women's History Month 8 9 and I will say that the long march toward full 10 equality for women in this country continues 11 follows the vision, leadership and every day acts of 12 courage that are well worth our remarking 13 celebrating. In keeping with our bipartisan tradition 14 15 Commission, also note that the women's 16 equality has long been bipartisan effort 17 championed by strong leaders across the political 18 aisle. 19 Whereas, feminism is often associated with 20 the Democratic Party, I offer a few very recent 21 examples of Republican leadership for women's rights. 22 Ιt Republican President Nixon's was 23 Presidential Task Force Women's Rights on and 24 Responsibilities that recommended adding sex

this Commission's jurisdiction,

discrimination to

1 which President Nixon supported in 1972. 2 Former First Lady Betty Ford lobbied extensively for women's rights and specifically for 3 4 the Equal Rights Amendment which has yet to ratified 5 and was named Time Magazine's Woman of the Year in 1975 for her efforts toward women's full equality. 6 7 As a child of that era and having grown up with ERA now pins and stickers displayed 8 mу 9 mother's office and in our home, especially 10 appreciate her leadership. 11 And, recently, more Carly Fiorina proclaimed the Republican Party as the party of 12 13 during suffrage her presidential recent 14 campaign in 2016. 15 I look forward to hearing more about the 16 rich and varied history of this civil rights movement 17 from our speakers today. And, I appreciate the 18 persistence of those who paved the way before me, 19 creating a space for freedoms I and my daughters now 20 enjoy. 21 Our first speaker, Page Harrington, is a 22 consulting public historian and preservationist 23 specializing in early 20th Century women's history. 24 As President of Page Harrington

LLC, she advises museums on creative and

Company,

1 practical strategies to integrate women's history into 2 existing museum interpretation exhibits and programs. Harrington's forthcoming book titled, 3 4 "Interpreting Suffrage, Women's Equality and Racism at Museums and Historic Sites," will be released in 5 spring of 2019. I look forward to reading it. 6 7 the former Executive Harrington is Director of the National Woman's Party at the Belmont-8 9 Paul Women's Equality National Monument, the founding 10 co-chair of the Women's History Affinity Group for the 11 American Association of State and Local History, and 12 serves on the Women's Vote Centennial Initiative. 13 She also advised the U.S. Congressional 14 Commission on their exploratory study for an American 15 Museum of Women's History as part of their Scholar 16 Committee. 17 Harrington holds two Master's degrees from 18 the University of San Diego, one in public history and 19 historic preservation, and the second in nonprofit 20 management and leadership. 21 Our second speaker, Fatima Goss Graves, is 22 the President and CEO of the National Women's Law 23 Center. Ms. Goss Graves has served in numerous 24 25 roles at the National Women's Law Center for more than

a decade and has a distinguished track record working across a broad set of issues central to women's lives including income security, health and reproductive rights, education access and workplace justice.

Ms. Goss Graves currently oversees the Center's administration of the Times Up Legal Defense Initiative which connects those who experience sexual misconduct including assault, harassment, abuse and related retaliation in the workplace or in trying to advance their careers, with legal and public relations assistance.

Before becoming CEO and President, she served as the Center's Senior Vice President for Programs where she led the organization's broad program agenda.

Prior to that, as the Center's Vice President for Education and Employment. She led the Center's Anti-discrimination Initiatives including work to promote equal pay and address harassment and violence at work and in school with a particular focus on outcomes for women and girls of color.

As I can attest, as having been on the receiving end of her impressive advocacy, she is widely recognized for her effectiveness in the complex public policy arena at both the state and federal

1 levels, regularly testifies before Congress 2 federal agencies and is a frequent speaker 3 conferences and other public education forums. 4 Ms. Goss Graves appears often in print and 5 on air as a legal expert on issues core to women's lives including in the New York Times, Wall Street 6 7 Journal, Washington Post, Associated Press, Chicago Tribune, LA Times, San Francisco Chronicle 8 9 MSNBC, PBS and NPR. 10 Ms. Harrington, we'll hear from you first. PAGE HARRINGTON, HISTORIAN AND PRESERVATIONIST 11 12 MS. HARRINGTON: Good morning, 13 Commissioners and Chair Lhamon. I'm delighted to be here today and speak to you a little bit in honor of 14 15 Women's History Month 16 I have prepared remarks and then, what I'm 17 hoping for is some questions and maybe a little bit of 18 dialogue going back and forth I think would be 19 fantastic. 20 CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Terrific. 21 MS. HARRINGTON: The women's suffrage 22 movement officially began with the Seneca Falls 1848 23 convention in and continued through the 24 ratification of the 19th Amendment in August of 1920 -25 which ultimately granted 26 million the right to vote.

1 Early icons such as Elizabeth 2 Stanton, Lucretia Mott, Sojourner Truth, Susan B. Anthony and Mary Church Terrell knew that women could 3 4 not better their own lives and the lives of their 5 children and their communities without enfranchisement and equal rights under the law. 6 7 The history of the National Woman's Party Burns who, begins with Alice Paul and Lucy 9 coincidentally, met in England while they were in jail 10 picketing with the Pankhurst family They were not encumbered by husbands or 11 12 children, so they could travel to England and work on 13 this important work. 14 They were both white, educated, middleclass women and they had the financial means and time 15 16 to take on the cause. 17 The Pankhursts used militant tactics like 18 heckling politicians, smashing windows, setting fires 19 in public trash cans, all to raise public awareness of 20 their suffrage demands. When Paul, Burns and the others returned 21 22 to the United States in 1910, they were determined to 23 bring these militant activities back and use them 24 here.

Alice and Lucy and many others began by

1 planning the March 3rd, 1913 parade. The parade was 2 meant to disrupt the arrival of the newly-elected President Wilson on the eve of his inauguration. 3 4 Instead, they hoped that the public would 5 watch more than 5,000 women march from the U.S. Capitol down Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House. 6 7 This type of spectacle was largely unheard of An 1913 and the public reacted very badly. 8 9 The women were violently attacked as they 10 The police stood by and simply watched the 11 riots unfold. Over 100 marchers were hospitalized and 12 ultimately, the Fort Myer Calvary had to be called in 13 to disburse the crowd. By 1916, women had the vote in only twelve 14 15 Alice Paul and Lucy Burns officially states. And, 16 founded the National Woman's Party. 17 Through a sustained campaign of mass 18 propaganda and nonviolent action, the National Woman's 19 Party campaigned for a federal suffrage amendment. 20 The organization brilliantly used 21 cartoons, posters, pamphlets and picket banners in 22 order to educate the public, influence politicians and 23 fight back against the long established hostility 24 toward the suffrage campaign.

The NWP very aggressively lobbied members

1 of Congress. Now, they were not the first to do this. 2 However, the strategic way in which they tracked 3 subjects made them very unique and 4 organizations later adopted their strategies. 5 The press often referred to their deadly political index which, in essence, was really just a 6 7 collection of index cards in which the NWP kept meticulous notes on every member of Congress. 8 9 But, their research was meticulous. 10 knew their hobbies, education, religious and family 11 economic background, where they stood on suffrage and 12 also other issues. 13 members The who conducted the 14 interviews left detailed notes that speak to 15 thoughts of Congress at the time. I have 16 examples. 17 He was so violently opposed as to even be 18 hostile in his attitude. He opposed the amendment on 19 grounds of states' rights but also on 20 principle of the everlasting inferiority of women. 21 And second, a smart aleck of the worst 22 My interview was a complete waste of time and a 23 sore trial on my patience. 24 Beginning in 1917, the NWP began picketing

For over two years, NWP members

the White House.

1 coordinated an ongoing demonstration in front of the 2 White House gates. Thousands of women known as the Silent 3 4 Sentinels came from across the country and took turns 5 picketing and engaging in civil disobedience. They burned Wilson's speeches and silently 6 7 held large banners for the president and everyone else to see with slogans like, how long must women wait 9 liberty? And, Mr. President, what will you do for 10 women's suffrage? 11 the pickets banners and These were 12 aggressive, direct and rhetorically brilliant, with 13 slogans meant to inspire and engage. it as commonplace today for 14 take 15 protesters to be outside of the White House. 16 until the NWP's picketing, this had actually never 17 been done before. 18 And so, as you can imagine, eager crowds 19 gather daily to read the new banners and to 20 watch the spectacles unfold. 21 When the United States entered World War I 22 1917, public sentiment changed. Across 23 country, thousands of women turned their attention to 24 the war effort and many expected the suffragists to do

so.

1 But, the NWP felt otherwise. During the 2 Civil War, suffragists had put their cause on hold and many felt that it had held them back for decades. 3 4 The banners they carried to the picket 5 line became more inflammatory, basically labeling President Wilson a hypocrite for fighting a war of 6 7 democracy abroad while not protecting women at home. One very powerful banner slogan was, 8 9 President, how long must women be denied a voice in 10 government which is conscripting their sons? They even called him Kaiser Wilson, which 11 12 is, you can imagine, did not go over well and actually 13 resulted in attacks on the suffragists. The police, again, made no effort to stop 14 15 the attacks or to apprehend the attackers. 16 request of the Administration, the police began to 17 arrest the suffragists. 18 These were well known social advocates and 19 prominent society women. In some cases, middle-aged 20 older women who were arrested on charges of 21 obstructing traffic. 22 Ultimately, over 2,000 women picketed the 23 White House, 500 were arrested and 168 were imprisoned 24 either at Occoquan Workhouse in Lorton, Virginia or in

the District of Columbia Jail.

1 They demanded to be treated as political 2 Instead, they were met with brutality. They were fed meals that consisted of sour bread, half 3 4 cooked vegetables and rancid soup with worms in it. 5 When the women went on hunger strikes, they were strapped down and forcibly fed. The oldest, 6 7 Mary Nolan, was 73 when she was arrested and dailed. The public and press reacted with outrage 8 9 and sympathy toward the women. 10 By 1918, the NWP's tactics, the backlash 11 from their imprisonment and the persistent lobbying 12 eventually forced President Wilson to endorse the 19th 13 Amendment as a war measure In 1919, both the House and the Senate 14 15 passed the Susan B. Anthony Amendment and on August 16 the 19th Amendment was signed into law, 26th, 1920, 17 granting 26 million women the right to vote, and it 18 took 72 years. only 19 Under Alice's leadership, the NWP then 20 turned their attention back to Congress. They worked 21 on hundreds of pieces of legislation that secured 22 marriage rights, the right to have custody of their 23 own children in case of divorce, the right education, the right to own property, the right to 24

keep their own wages and over 100 more.

1 Most notably, in 1923, the NWP produced a 2 new piece of legislation, the Equal Rights Amendment. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied 3 4 or abridged by the United States or by any state on 5 account of sex. The NWP continued to work for more than 50 6 7 economic legal, social and end the years discrimination against women both here in the United 9 States and abroad. 10 From 1929, when the NWP moved into the 11 Sewall-Belmont House, it became the principle center 12 for women's rights activism through '30s, '40s, '50s 13 both nationally and internationally. The NWP was, for many years, the only 14 15 national organization committed to raising the legal 16 status of women through the Equal Rights Amendment and 17 other pieces of legislation. 18 Some examples include the 1922 Cable Act 19 impacted women who lost their citizenship 20 because they married foreigners or resided abroad. 21 The repeal of Section 213 of the National 22 Recovery Act of 1932 which eliminated the barring of 23 federal employees working for the government if their 24 spouses were also so employed.

1963 Equal Pay Act made it illegal to pay

1 women lower rates for the same jobs strictly on the 2 basis of sex. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and 3 4 Title ΙX Education Amendments prohibiting 5 discrimination against girls in federally funded 6 athletic programs. 7 By the 1930s, the National Woman's Party was operating the house as a public museum and sharing 8 9 the history of suffrage. In order to protect the 10 house and continue sharing that history, the National 11 Woman's Party began yet another campaign, this time to 12 secure recognition for the house as 13 monument. 14 So, 39 years after Alice Paul passed away, 15 the house became the first national monument named for 16 two women, NWP benefactor, Alva Belmont and Alice Paul 17 and the first named for women's equality. 18 On Equal Pay Day of 2016, President Barak 19 declared the Sewall-Belmont House was now the 20 Belmont-Paul Women's Equality National Monument so 21 that generations of girls and boys would hear the 22 story and be inspired. 23 In partnership with the National Park 24 Service, the NWP remains in the house and is the

principle steward of the archival collection of over

1 30,000 artifacts including many of the original 2 banners that I discussed. The NWP also remains a public convener 3 4 hosting programs and discussions that focus on women's 5 equality. Within the first year under National Park 6 7 Service, visitation was up 75 percent and the house 8 has already undergone assessment for upcoming 9 preservation projects. 10 However, there is still much work to do 11 before we note the centennial of the 19th Amendment in 12 2020. 13 In this very limited summary of the NWP's 14 campaign for suffrage, you'll notice that there were very few references to the many women of color who 15 16 also worked for suffrage. 17 And, until now, I haven't even mentioned 18 vast racial and economic discrimination of the 19 movement. 20 For example, the African-American women 21 who marched in the 1913 suffrage parade including Ida 22 Wells-Barnett and many women from Howard University 23 had to march at the back of the procession. 24 Wells, of course, did not agree 25 marched instead with the Illinois delegation, but the

1 vast majority of women did. 2 In the early years after the Seneca Falls convention, the American Woman Suffrage Association 3 4 worked toward universal suffrage. 5 However, as the decades passed, the larger suffrage associations, including the NWP, bowed to 6 7 pressure from their members in the south who were interested only in the voting rights of white women. 8 9 Because the women of color were excluded 10 from the larger organizations, they're also largely 11 left out of the interpretation at historic sites 12 today. And, many of their documents and artifacts are 13 not included in archives and repositories which makes their stories incredibly hard to find. 14 15 There is, however, great work being done. National Park Service and NWP are jointly working on 16 17 research that will yield materials and information and 18 allow a more accurate interpretation of suffrage that 19 can then be shared with the visiting public. 20 Scholars and historians including myself 21 continue to research and publish on this subject. 22 And, grassroots organizations like Chick

> History in Tennessee and the National Civil Rights Museum at the Lorraine Motel are actively working to digitize family records of African-American women

23

24

1 during the suffrage campaign and make them available 2 for research. The goal being, that when the exhibits and 3 4 programs and celebrations focusing on the centennial 5 of the 19th Amendment in 2020 will finally share the accurate and honest story of the suffrage campaign, 6 7 one that reflects all communities and is inclusive of all voices. 8 9 Thank you. 10 CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks much, 11 Harrington. 12 Ms. Goss Graves? 13 FATIMA GOSS GRACES, PRESIDENT AND CEO, NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER 14 15 GOSS GRAVES: Thank you so much for 16 Commission. having me And, it's really an at the 17 exciting time, I believe, in the women's movement and 18 the movement for gender justice broadly for a few 19 reasons that I will promise I will to the history 20 party, but I want to just sort of set the table about 21 where we are now. 22 And, part of the reason that 23 exciting is because we, I think, are growing to have a 24 different understanding about the real importance of

organizing and doing work at the intersections of

gender discrimination but the way it intersects with many other forms of oppression.

And, there are also new leaders in this work whose long-time advocacy to improve the lives of women and girls is coming to the surface and their names are getting known and will hopefully be documented in our history.

And, there is a different level of energy, the sort of energy that led to the greatest mass mobilization that we've seen in our nation's history with a women's march that centered the experiences of women of color.

themselves, are engaged as women, They are leading both in activists in new ways. making calls to Congress, they are leading in who 'halls, women lawyers which we're shows up at town excited leading in really about their are volunteerism.

And, women in both parties are running for office in record numbers.

And so, for the work we do at the National Women's Law Center, which was founded 45 years ago to be doing this work in the middle of such a vibrant and energetic understanding and such very serious attention to women and girls lives, is really exciting

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for all of us.

And, one of the things that's happening right now is women are leading conversations and really standing in solidarity and trying to break the silence around harassment and violence and the ways in which it impacts their lives.

And, that has come to prominence through the framework of MeToo. And, most of you probably hear -- have heard about MeToo, but I'll just say a couple of things about it.

It was the long-time rallying cry that was developed first by Tarana Burke in her local organizing to let survivors of harassment and violence know that they were not alone and that there was collective — that there could be healing and joy in coming together as a collective and understanding that you are not alone and, yes, me too.

It was amplified in October and millions became to share their experiences in digital spaces and then in real life and now, it's showing up at institutions.

But, it also has been the space where many first learned about harassment and violence in deep ways and the ways in which it touched so many institutions, the ways in which workers facing working

1 in the lowest paid jobs in restaurants and hotels and 2 on farms actually had a lot in common with those who were in the upper paid jobs and even those who were 3 4 working in Hollywood. 5 And, that common understanding is what galvanized a coalition of initially 300, but far more 6 7 now, entertainment influencers and attorneys to create an initiative that's designed to help low wage workers 8 9 connect with attorneys who can represent them in 10 harassment and related retaliation cases. 11 And, that is what became what is now the 12 Times Up Legal Defense Fund. 13 I will just tell you a couple things about 14 the Times Up Legal Defense Fund. It, in two months, 15 has raised over \$21 million to support these types of 16 cases. 17 But, what I have been truly inspired by is 18 the way people have showed up to support. We now have 19 almost 700 attorneys how have joined with us to say 20 that they will be willing to take on these cases. 21 We've had over 20,000 people contribute to 22 the fund in increments as small as \$5.00 which is 23 really their way of saying I want to support this 24 effort.

And, we have had over 2,000 people contact

1 us since January 1st seeking our assistance, really 2 bravely, many people unfortunately are calling us too late because they have been reliving experiences that 3 4 were long ago. 5 And so, some people are calling us to just tell their story so that someone knows. They now know 6 7 that something that happened five years ago, there's not a lot of protection for you under our 8 federal 9 laws, but they wanted to still name their experiences. 10 So, for us, it's really just extraordinary 11 to be living in such a vibrant period and doing this 12 work where, in a time where we really feel like it's a moment that stands to push institutions to no longer 13 engage in the historic shaming and blaming 14 15 silencing survivors that has occurred historically. 16 And, as exciting as I find this movement 17 and this moment, I have been thinking a lot about the 18 people over time who laid the groundwork for 19 where we are today. 20 And, in many ways, their stories and the 21 stories of the leaders, in particular, have been 22 really critical points in time and have not really 23 gotten the prominence. So, I'll start, you know, thanks to Oprah, 24

we now know the name of Recy Taylor. And, Recy Taylor

was a black woman who was kidnaped and gang-raped by six white men while leaving church in 1944.

And, took, at the time, the very unusual step of trying to seek justice through the criminal justice system.

And, although two grand juries failed to indict, the outrage about this unaddressed violence sparked critical mobilizing around the country. And, that mobilizing seeded the groundwork for the Montgomery Bus Boycott built on decades later.

So, when we think about Recy Taylor's story, many of us didn't know it in modern times, but those of us who were steeped in this work really believe we are building on the power of sharing those sorts of stories and experiences to mobilize people into action really broadly.

Carmita Wood. And Carmita was a black woman who was, at the time, refused unemployment insurance on the grounds that the decision to leave her job at Cornell Lab after years of sexual harassment was a personal decision, it was personal reasons so she did not qualify they said for unemployment insurance.

But, that did not stop her. She worked with advocates and lawyers to form what was then

called Working Women United. And, it was one of the first organizations to really lay the foundation and language for sexual harassment and framed the issue of sexual harassment as not a personal issue for people to deal with, but as a matter of discrimination.

That's critical for the moment that we're in. Part of what we're dealing with now is a cultural shift where people are thinking about harassment and violence as not just personal issues for people to contend with by themselves, but structural issues including as ones that are covered by our discrimination laws that are going to require also structural solutions.

It's also important to remind us of Michelle Vincent. Michelle Vincent was also a black woman who was working as a bank teller who stood up to her employer and brought the case that established in the Supreme Court that harassment was protected under Title 7.

When she brought that case, her bank's defense was essentially that she was either lying or promiscuous and dressed really provocatively or all of those things.

The Court rejected those arguments and, you know, you think back to that period of time that,

you know, Michelle Vincent carried the weight of not only working there for so many years and enduring this sort of abuse, but also the abuse of standing up to her employer and hearing reflected back to you that all of these things that are so steeped in race and sex stereotypes were cause for you not to have a claim.

It also reminds us of Paulette Barnes who worked at the EPA and also stood up to her boss. Her case led to the Federal Court of Appeals finding that sexual harassment constituted sex discrimination under Title VII before the Vincent case.

And, this case really led the first legal groundwork and framework for so many cases to come for us to understand how harassment really is a form of discrimination covered by our civil rights laws.

And, it is all of their bravery that paved the way for Anita Hill to testify in 1991 and for now the millions who are saying, me too.

I also wanted to let you know about someone who's very near and dear to the National Women's Law Center, and that is LaShonda Davis.

LaShonda Davis was our client and she stood up to her school in the Title IX case that established that schools have an obligation to address

1 harassment. 2 I'll tell you a little bit about her. was in 5th grade and she reported harassment, 3 4 unwanted touching, repeatedly to her teachers and to 5 the school. Her parents reported repeatedly. And, school's 6 the response was 7 effectively, kids will be kids, boys will be boys. Her parents complained for months and, 8 9 after months, the only resolution was to move LaShonda 10 to the back of the classroom. Finally, her parents found a suicide note. 11 12 There was no investigation into the claims. And, in that case, the Supreme Court held that schools, yes, 13 did have an obligation to address sexual harassment 14 15 and set forth the standard for doing so. 16 that case was important for so many 17 other reasons. It was really the national rejection 18 of the idea that, you know, the concept of kids will 19 kids or boys will be boys is a thing that should 20 happen and unchallenged. 21 It was also rejected the idea that was 22 pervasive at the time that there was nothing that 23 schools could do in response. 24 And, it also is a good reminder of the

powers of students and parents and all of their

1 supporters to be able to speak up and challenge 2 practices that they see an unfair and that leaves students feeling unsafe. 3 4 And, LaShonda's bravery and her family's 5 bravery really led the groundwork for an exciting and vibrant student led movement twenty years later. And, 6 7 when those students took their schools to task and took the government to task for failing to put 8 sort of systems in place for preventing and address 9 10 sexual violence, they were building on the work of 11 LaShonda Davis and her family. 12 So, it's worth pointing out one other 13 group of women whose stories don't get told very often of iron workers who joined 14 and that was a group 15 together to challenge sexual harassment in their 16 workplace. 17 they became, together, the first 18 certified class to pursue a class action sexual 19 harassment claim against their employer. 20 And, again, understanding that harassment 21 just a personal private problem that 22 sometimes can be a systemic problem that affects many 23 different employees together. 24 These and so many other leaders really

showed their ability to change the way we think about

1 issues that undermine women's lives. And, they led 2 the fight for law and policy change largely quietly with few people knowing their names. 3 Today's leaders, I believe, are also 4 5 following in their footsteps and helping us to rise and frame how we should be experiencing this current 6 7 moment we are in. And, I'm going to just name their names so 8 that we begin to have more of a record and memory of 9 10 who they are and the work that they are importantly 11 doing. So, whether that is Tarana Burke, 12 organized for so long under the MeToo framework and 13 has really emerged as a national north star reminding 14 15 us about the healing journey for survivors and that 16 that is as important as any other conversation. 17 She also reminds us to organize with joy, 18 which is an important thing for our movement. 19 Or, Monica Ramirez who really graciously 20 steered hundreds of thousands of farm workers to 21 support an align with Hollywood. She really reminds 22 us of the power of women working on farms when she 23 sent a letter to Hollywood starting Dear Sisters. 24 That letter, basically, said we know your

experiences because we have shared those experiences,

too. And, rather than saying and our experiences are worse because we're doing it in conditions that you can't imagine, she said, we've been organizing for decades. We're here to fight with you for your fight.

And, we're here for this shared fight.

That is really -- that collective approach in so many ways has -- is what inspired Times Up to not just be about the entertainment industry but to be about all sectors.

Or Saru Jayaraman, who long ago helped us all to make the connection between harassment and tipped wages that restaurant workers are subject to.

She constantly reminds us that any solution to harassment at work must also address the underlying conditions that mean that harassment is prevalent.

So, for the work we do, I don't want to suggest that these are easy times, but as the work continues to push our culture, our laws and our policies through, I think a lot about who our modern day Recy's and Michelle's and Paulette's are.

And, I have no doubt that so many other new voices will rise in this time and working to try to secure a world where women can work where they want, attend schools where they want with equity, with

dignity and real safety and lead the lives that they
want without these sort of conditions that diminish us
all.
So, thank you so much for having me and I
look forward to any conversation and questions.
CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks very much to both of
you. I really appreciate both of your presentations.
And, I'll open for questions and comments
from my fellow Commissioners.
Commissioner Heriot?
COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I would like to say
a word on behalf of the great State of New Jersey.
You mentioned Seneca Falls which, of
course, is where we date the beginning of the women's
movement.
But, in 1776, the New Jersey Constitution
actually was rather ambiguous about whether women
could vote, it used the work inhabitants. There were
other requirements as well.
But, in 1790, New Jersey had a statute
that very clearly allowed women to vote, it used he or
she. It's kind of a mixed story on New Jersey, but
it's a fairly interesting one.
it's a fairly interesting one. But, women were voting in New Jersey in

Century.

I think in about 1707, there was an election where there accusations of fraud and there were some accusations that men were voting twice, once dressed as men and then once dressed as women. I, of course, cannot comment on the truth of that. New Jersey ended up repealing that law.

But, nevertheless, there was a period where New Jersey was leading in this area.

I also should say a word on behalf of Wyoming and that is the first state to enter the Union with women voting.

Congress originally balked at the notion of admitting Wyoming because they thought this would be a bad example across the country to have a state where women were voting.

And so, they said, hey guys, you know, if you like get rid of this women suffrage thing, then you're going to grease the wheels a lot more quickly.

And, the Wyoming legislature, to its everlasting credit, cabled back to congressional leaders, and I've written it down here so I'll get the words right, "we will remain out of the Union 100 years rather then come in without the women."

And so, eventually, Congress relented and

1 by the end of the century, there were four states that 2 allowed women to vote, all mountain states. mountain women. 3 4 CHAIR LHAMON: Madam Vice Chair? 5 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: 6 Harrington, I listened to you talk about all of the 7 efforts that were put forward that eventually led President Wilson to support the 19th Amendment. 8 9 And, I found myself thinking back to the 10 ERA and all of the efforts made during my lifetime to 11 get that amendment passed. 12 And, I was wondering whether you had any 13 thoughts on why we've been unsuccessful in passing the 14 ERA Amendment? 15 HARRINGTON: MS So, it is -- there are 16 definitely parallels, I think, between the suffrage 17 campaigns and certainly the campaign for equal rights. 18 It's astonishing to most people, and I'll 19 was the Executive Director of the National 20 Woman's Party for about nine years, and in all of the 21 tours and all of the hundreds of times that I've led 22 people through that house, they say two things to me 23 that just never fails to shock me. 24 The first is, why didn't I learn this in 25 school? To that, I can't -- I know of a lot of

1 reasons you didn't learn it in school, I didn't learn 2 it in school. I didn't learn it until graduate 3 school. 4 And, the second is, they almost always 5 assume that the Equal Rights Amendment was something that was put forth and passed and is part of the 6 7 Constitution since the 1970s. So, the vastness of these campaigns 8 9 how long it actually takes to get this change to 10 happen is really shocking for 11 especially younger people because they're thinking, my 12 goodness, 1923? The '70s sounds like ancient times, right, to most kids that are in high school today or 13 14 college. 15 (LAUGHTER 16 HARRINGTON: It is. So, it's very 17 fascinating 18 you know, I think that, 19 thing, it's complicated. And, two, just like the 20 suffrage campaign, there were very many factions 21 working on different things. And, there was not a lot 22 of unity to really push it forward. 23 The Equal Rights Amendment has had a lot 24 of -- there's been a lot of resurgence. There's been

a lot of talk about it, certainly in the last few

1	years.
2	Nevada just passed the Equal Rights
3	Amendment, I think it was in 2016 or early 2017, which
4	leaves two states, if they were to ratify, then and
5	the time limit was eliminated then we would have an
6	Equal Rights Amendment.
7	But, a lot of people still don't agree
8	with it because they believe that a lot of the blanket
9	protection has already been done in other pieces of
10	legislation and policies. And, I know that Ms. Goss
11	Graves can certainly speak to that much better than I
12	can.
13	But, I do know that there are still
14	organizations that are working on it and do believe
15	that, again, we're not equal under the law, not yet.
16	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Madam Chair,
17	may I ask one more question?
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Sure.
19	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: This one is
20	for Ms. Goss Graves.
21	Thank you, thank you, thank you for the
22	names that you've shared with us and the tremendous
23	work that they did and the debt that we owe all of
24	them.

But, as I listened to you talk about Recy

1 Taylor and Carmita Woods and Michelle Vincent and all 2 the others, I found myself wondering what is it that these ladies had in common that gave them the courage 3 4 and whatever else to go forward and to stand up and to 5 complain? And then, selfishly, I asked how can I get 6 7 a hold of some of that? 8 (LAUGHTER) 9 MS. GOSS GRAVES: Well, I also want that, 10 too. 11 (LAUGHTER) 12 MS. GOSS GRAVES: But, I will maybe answer 13 bit differently because, question little 14 sometimes when people are coming forward and we've 15 been finding this in the many intakes we have gotten, 16 when they take those first steps, I don't know that 17 people always know the range of things they're about 18 to confront. Right? 19 They're seeking fairness and many times, 20 people sort of think, it should be fair, so I should 21 just be able to do this thing. 22 And, so, the fact that they were also not 23 just able to initiate but also endure through many, 24 many hurdles, not just legal hurdles, but also the

sort of shaming that many of them dealt with.

And, to the extent that there was public reaction and, you know, it was sometimes negative public reaction.

And, recently, the Washington Post talked a little bit about what it was like for Michelle Vincent when she brought her case at the time. And, there was, you know, coverage about what it is she wore to the Supreme Court argument and coverage about and debate about, you know, is it really illegal to not want to sleep with your boss?

You know, they, at the time when people were trying to establish these principles firmly in the law and there was a lot of cultural unsettlement and not legal clarity, you know, so I'm not really answering your question, I'm just saying, in some ways, it was even harder than you can imagine because there wasn't the certainty.

And, when I think about the people who are coming forward today where there is more legal certainty on a number of fronts and have long been the case for decades, yet they have these experiences that don't get addressed by their employers.

So, one of the questions that we are asking ourselves now really deeply is, where that disconnect is? Why is it that so -- that when there

1 is survey data as high as 1 in 3 and in some sectors, 2 even higher, people say, yes, I've experienced harassment, and actually, no, I probably report it. 3 4 Right. 5 So, why there is this disconnect, this -despite our current legal framework? 6 7 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: I think your define more 8 response has helped me clearly question that I'm trying to ask and that is, what is 9 10 it that these ladies have in common that, in fact, 11 allowed them to endure what they were later subjected 12 to? 13 MS. GOSS GRAVE: Yes, you know, one thing that is the case for several of them when I've read 14 15 about their back stories that they all had really 16 strong family support as they were coming forward. 17 And so, even though you have, in some 18 cases, a public rejection, there was family support. 19 that was true and Anita Hill has even talked 20 about that, that deep family support that she had 21 during her testimony. 22 So, that might be one factor. VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: 23 Thank you. 24 CHAIR LHAMON: I'm really struck listening 25 to both of you about the efforts that you both have

made and that the organizations you work in have both made to give voice to, give visibility to the wide variety of people who have populated this effort and this struggle.

And, I appreciate, and Ms. Harrington, in your historical perspective, the conscious effort to explain that this is not only a white women's movement, that this is a movement that all women have participated in. And, that that movement has included much attention about that topic as well.

And, Ms. Goss Graves has, in your discussion now, about making sure that today, this is a movement that reflects all of who women are and is inclusive in the civil rights effort.

I think that resonates for me and also I so appreciate Ms. Harrington, your effort to ensure that, at the 100th anniversary, we will be able to see and hear and have context for all of whom -- all of whose shoulders we stand on now and what brought us here.

I also was struck in your last answer, Ms. Goss Graves, with the notion of the strength of a family support, in contrast, Ms. Harrington, to what you said about two women who were unencumbered by spouses and children in their ability to move forward.

1 And, I think that makes me think that we 2 think of families in broad and narrow terms, right? 3 MS. GOSS GRAVES: Right. 4 CHAIR LHAMON: And, the ways that I 5 imagine they had support that led them able to move forward, but at a time when spousal or children 6 7 support would have been an albatross and that would have been an impediment and I hope maybe you could 8 9 speak more to that. 10 definitely. Right, MS. HARRINGTON: So, it was. When we think about family, 11 12 we think about our biological family or the families 13 that raised us and that we lived in. And, a lot of the suffragists did have 14 15 and they did have children at support of husbands 16 the support in their own relationships 17 allowed them to do this work. 18 But, I think with Alice and Lucy, 19 particular, they had a singular focus to making sure 20 that this was going to happen. And, in order to do 21 that, they had to make that their main focus. 22 And so, they lived in -- there were five 23 different headquarters, the one 144 Constitution which 24 is now Belmont-Paul was the final headquarters. And, 25 they had five headquarters where they all lived, so

1 they had dormitories. 2 Women would come from across the country to learn how to lobby and how to picket. 3 And, of 4 course, remember, in the 1930s or the 19-teens, there 5 wasn't an American Express card and you couldn't just pick up, you know, your Southwest Rewards card and 6 7 head over to Washington, D.C. And, a woman, especially alone, 8 couldn't do that. 9 10 So, for her to have a community, a family 11 that was built into the National Woman's Party was a 12 big part of that. And, the other organizations were 13 very similar. 14 this see in all And, types of 15 organizations certainly 16 think for them to move it forward 17 in that short amount of time after having peaks and 18 valleys and certainly languishing for 60-some odd 19 years, I think that it took that type of attitude to 20 push it forward no matter what to ensure that it was 21 done. 22 Now, interestingly, Lucy Burns left the 23 movement after the 19th Amendment was ratified and 24 went back to her family. And, Alice Paul did not.

She continued to stay. She lived in the house at 144

Constitution until probably 1974 and then she passed away in 1977.

So, still, today, we have women that would

come in and say, when I was a 19-year-old co-ed and I was here in the '70s, I walked up those steps and Alice Paul answered the door. That's phenomenal that that was her only -- that was her -- the only thing in her life that she wanted to do was work toward equality for women.

Now, she wasn't -- she did not look at it in an intersectional way that we, of course, would look at it today. And so, there are issues that are a little bit harder to resolve, but you do have to say, the circumstances in her life gave her the ability to stand there and do that work with many others.

But, to do that work, really, until she passed away.

CHAIR LHAMON: I wonder if the two of you could reflect also on, in particular, Ms. Harrington, you described about the violent opposition to some of the equality efforts.

And, they seem with the benefit of hindsight, like pretty core equality components, you know, that right vote or the right to be recognized as a full person.

97 1 When you included the quote about the 2 everlasting inferiority of women, obviously, that does not strike a cord for me. 3 4 MS. HARRINGTON: Right, no. 5 CHAIR LHAMON: But, the notion of both physically violent reaction as well as psychically 6 7 violent reaction to the efforts that these women led and persisted through, I think is also a theme that 8 9 rides through what you've described in the 10 discussions with Goss Graves of the specific people 11 that you identified. 12 And, the pre-litigation discussion that begins with Recy Taylor and that's a history that's 13 hard to hear, and also hard to reflect on in this 14 15 moment, especially when we don't have an Equal Rights 16 Amendment still, and some of the core tenants that 17 garnered that violent opposition are tenants that we 18 have not yet achieved. 19 MS. GOSS GRAVES: And, it's interesting, 20 and I'm just sort of thinking about this right now, 21 you know, one of the reasons we may not know their 22 is because, for some them, they sort or 23 retreated a bit after their experience.

did

experience very serious threats against themselves,

expend --

And,

they

24

25

thev

1	against their broader families for coming forward and
2	bringing these cases, for naming experiences of
3	harassment and violence and inequality that that came
4	at personal risk. But, that also came at family, and
5	in some cases, community risk.
6	MS. HARRINGTON: It is amazing to think
7	that something as simple as voting today or the
8	ability to vote today was so controversial for so many
9	years.
10	I appreciate Commissioner Heriot, the
11	remarks that you made about even prior to 1848,
12	because there were states and there were territories
13	that did allow women to vote.
14	It seems like sometimes equality ebbs and
15	flows. Sometimes we make progress and then, again, it
16	kind of swings back a little bit.
17	As far as the violence was concerned,
18	particularly in during World War I. So, the women
19	were very much expected to give up that campaign and
20	to retreat and to go back and work for the war effort.
21	And, many, many of them did.
22	But, again, the leaders of the NWP thought
23	that that would just set them back even further.
24	So, from the public's perspective, you
25	have Washington, D.C. outside of the White House. You

have sailors and soldiers that are returning from or on their way overseas to fight in World War I. And, they're seeing these women stand there and picket with banners that say things like Kaiser Wilson.

Now, the Kaiser Wilson banner did not survive, shockingly. There are supposed to be a couple of small fragments of it at the Smithsonian, but it's not -- we're not sure.

But, a lot of the other ones did which always amazes me that we have this collection of almost a 1,000 textiles that survived because the women were beaten, horribly beaten. And, that is not -- that's while they were on the street, that's not even what happened when they were jailed.

So, it really is astonishing. There are women that talk in their firsthand accounts about being forcibly fed. Their teeth were knocked out, right? They're strapped down, they have these big tubes shoved down their throat, irritating everything. And then, the vomiting that just took place.

So, just the small snippets of what I've shared with you are absolutely horrific. It is not unlike plenty of other people in many different circumstances when they're fighting for rights that these same types of things have happened.

1 So, it is a little bit shocking to think 2 about it that something as simple as being able to 3 vote. 4 I always try to make sure that I share 5 with people, this is a right that we have and it is also a responsibility. So, to vote, to be civic 6 7 minded, to be civically engaged, to make sure that you're educating yourself and voting, no matter what 8 9 you vote for, just make sure that you do engage and 10 you do vote. 11 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank y 12 Commissioner Adequile? 13 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Yes, both of your presentations were so full and rich of layers of 14 15 history that are important. 16 I'm trying to synthesize some And so, 17 lessons from the history that can help us think about 18 how we go forward. 19 And, I have two questions in mind. 20 first is, that obviously laws and enforcement and 21 education and practices all come together in a range 22 of civil rights contexts to protect equality. 23 And, I'm wondering if you have used, from the history, about how the relative contribution of 24 25 these pieces have advanced or stood as impediments to

1 women's equality. 2 Why don't I pause with that one, because there's a lot in there and then I'll come back with 3 4 the next one. 5 MS. GOSS GRAVES: Well, and, you know, one thing that I think about is, I fully agree with you 6 7 that it's usually a mix of law and policy and culture 8 change. 9 And, that sometimes you have one out there 10 leading far ahead of the other and it takes a while 11 for the other to catch up. 12 And, I think we have seen that for sure in 13 the area around harassment and violence in particular 14 where there were some legal shifts, but the cultural 15 shift hadn't yet fully happened. 16 the Vincent case where the Supreme 17 Court said, yes, Title VII covers sexual harassment, 18 1986. But the EEOC didn't actually start to 19 receive significant levels of harassment charges until 20 after the national conversation following Anita Hill's 21 testimony in 1991. 22 So, you know, that period of time, it was 23 sort of on the books but not actually made very 24 meaningful.

And, the converse is sometimes true as

well where you have a really rich cultural conversation but not yet the legal framework or administrative framework or even the institutional changes that would make these cultural conversations real and lasting.

And, the moment we are in right now is extraordinarily cultural, right? There are conversations happening at every level. And, there are some policy changes that are happening.

You know, you had just last month, the House, in a bipartisan way, finally fixed its sort of extraordinary system that it had had in place for 20 years to deal with discrimination complaints against the House of Representatives.

And, you know, there were all sorts of barriers that were built in. Like, there was, you know, a waiting period before you actually filed a formal complaint or you had to get counseling and be really, really sure you wanted to do it and mandatory arbitration.

You know, all sorts of things that don't happen in the private sector or you wouldn't say, yes, you need to really think hard about filing that complaint. You need a cooling off period. No one would build that in today in the private sector.

1 So, they have made changes in a bipartisan 2 way in the House to address that. That would not have happened but for MeToo and there had been bills to fix 3 4 that for decades, so it wasn't as if there wasn't an 5 idea to fix it. But, there is a lot of work to do to catch 6 7 up with the cultural period we're in. 8 MS. HARRINGTON: Absolutely. And, 9 add that, to loop back to when we were talking about 10 the Equal Rights Amendment, in the 1970s when there 11 was a lot of opposition for that, and ultimately, the 12 -- it was not ratified. 13 A couple of the main issues that women did 14 not support it, would there be no maternity leave? 15 Would girls have to register for the draft the same as 16 they turned 18? Would we have unisex boys when 17 bathrooms? Would women serve in the military? Would 18 serve in forward zones? 19 Well, a lot of those things, if you just 20 think about, just those few things that I've just 21 named, within the last fifteen to twenty years, a lot 22 of those things have already sort of been culturally 23 decided. 24 We've talked through them, communities

wrangled with them, we make progress. And now, those

1 things aren't nearly as upsetting as they would have 2 been in the '70s and especially in the early '80s as 3 well. 4 So, you're right, sometimes there's the framework and 5 then sometimes there's practical side. What does culture want? 6 What does 7 the culture want? What can the community -- what type 8 of change can the community withstand and 9 emerge? 10 So, a lot of things just have to work 11 themselves out. And, perhaps, that is maybe a silver 12 lining to why things take so long, because some of 13 those other questions just sort of naturally get taken We still have plenty of things to work out 14 care of. 15 as far as that is concerned, but some of the bigger 16 are not necessarily such a big deal ones were 17 today. 18 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Great, thank you. 19 And, my last question is, I have two 20 teenaged daughters and I'm thinking about pieces of 21 this wonderful presentation that I can bring back to 22 them and, indeed, that we can be sharing more broadly 23 with people across the country. 24 And so, I would ask if both of you have a

core lessons from the history of

couple of

1 struggle for women's equality that we should think 2 about as we take this fight forward? Are there any distillations of the history 3 4 that are important to think about as we push forward 5 to get to the next place in terms of women's equality in the country? 6 7 And, hard question, but I'm open to any 8 thoughts you may have. 9 MS. HARRINGTON: Well, would 10 certainly for teenaged boys and girls, it's important 11 for them to understand that history did not just 12 unfold out of the pages of the textbook. These were 13 actually real people that were grappling with real 14 different and real difficult situations. 15 And, each person who played a role in that 16 had a choice to make of what side of history they were 17 And, ultimately, it comes down to knowing on. 18 yourself, knowing what you find valuable and then 19 making sure that you're educated about that and moving 20 forward to make sure that those rights or those -- or 21 the inequality is worked forward so that you're not 22 leaving others behind. 23 But, I think, to let them know that it's 24 real people just like them who are making these

decisions is very important.

1	And then, second, I would say is to get
2	engaged. And, you know, I'm terrible with names and
3	I'm terrible with dates, so I became a historian.
4	(LAUGHTER)
5	MS. HARRINGTON: But, it's not all about
6	dates and names, it really is about what those stories
7	make you feel, how you make that connection.
8	So, historic sites are absolutely amazing
9	as are museums. And, I would say, you know, just
10	taking the time to go explore those resources that you
11	have in your own community, that also helps broaden
12	your thoughts and will lead you to being more true to
13	yourself and more true to what you actually believe in
14	and want to work for.
15	MS. GOSS GRAVES: That's a very good
16	lesson.
17	And, I will echo one thing that you said,
18	it's that individuals really matter and I think about,
19	in the moment we're in, how powerful for each silent
20	breaker to tell their story and realize, all of a
21	sudden, you're not an individual, you're in a full
22	community.
23	And then, the second thing is a lesson
24	that we are still learning in the women's movement,
25	and that is but our true equality really requires

1	it to be for all women.
2	And, that, you know, there has been
3	beautiful fits and starts over that real question over
4	time. Do you take an inch if that means cording off,
5	you know, one population or another?
6	And, I think that the lesson around caring
7	and pushing for full equality for all women is one
8	that we should be, not just remembering, but
9	implementing going forward.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you both.
11	I want to make sure that our Commissioners
12	on the phone have a chance to ask questions if they
13	have any.
14	Commissioner Heriot, you have
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Do we have time for
16	another one from me?
17	CHAIR LHAMON: We do, but it sounded like
18	there was on the phone, too.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, hi. I want to
20	thank the speakers very much for their presentation
21	today.
22	I really don't have any questions other
23	than to just note that everything that happens is
24	related to everything else.
25	And, the courage and the deadlock upon

1 which we stand today is, in part, because of the work 2 of these early pioneers. 3 But, I just wanted to note that one of the 4 pioneers in the '80s and '90s and up until today, 5 Representative Louise Slaughter just passed away. was the author of the Violence Against Women Act which 6 7 had dramatic impact on raising the issue and reducing 8 domestic violence in our country. 9 And, she was a friend of mine and a true 10 champion and someone who proudly stood in the shoes of 11 those who came before her. 12 CHAIR LHAMON: And, she was until today, 13 the longest serving member of Congress. Commissioner Heriot? 14 15 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I wanted to go back 16 to what Ms. Harrington was saying about the Seneca 17 Falls conference. 18 And, you know, you're right, this is -- we 19 the history of women's movement back to that 20 point because it was a single event. 21 But, there were also things that were 22 going on just before that and that included the Seneca 23 Falls conference. And, it connects up 24 Commission. 25 We are the Commission on Civil Rights.

1 But, civil rights meant something different in those 2 They had a definition that basically was, civil rights on the one hand and political rights on the 3 4 other. 5 And so, when Elizabeth Cady Stanton was talking about, yes, we should, you know, argue for 6 7 voting rights. At first, Lucretia Mott said, I think 8 9 quoting here, you know, oh, Lizzy, you know, 10 make us look foolish. focused on civil 11 But, they were more 12 And, to them, that meant the right to own 13 to be sued and they were property and the right focused not on all women, but on married women 14 15 because, under common law at the time, single women 16 and widows already had those rights, but married women 17 did not. And, in particular, the right to be sued 18 19 doesn't sound like a great idea, it sounds like, you 20 know, oh, who wants that? But, when you think about 21 it, no one will lend you money if you cannot be sued 22 to get that money back. 23 So, that meant that married women couldn't 24 farms, they couldn't operate their

And, we were living in a frontier society

businesses.

1	where, you know, we think of divorce as all too common
2	today, it's sad. But, desertion was a big problem
3	then.
4	You know, men would just pick up and move
5	west and their wives would be left back in the east
6	with no means of support unless they could borrow
7	money. And so, that hugely important.
8	The New York Married Women's Act was in
9	1848, I believe, you're nodding yes, so it sounds like
10	I have you're right.
11	And so, that was a huge movement and one
12	that doesn't get enough attention today.
13	MS. HARRINGTON: Right, it is important to
14	remember how different the world was at that time.
15	And, it's just the vote, it seems very simple, at that
16	time, if a person died, if a man died and he left his
17	estate to he couldn't leave his estate to his
18	daughter, she could not inherit, there was no land
19	ownership.
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Oh no, she could,
21	she could, she could, she could.
22	MS. HARRINGTON: But, if she was married -
23	_
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: If she's married,
25	then it's her husband's.

1 MS. HARRINGTON: It's her husband's, 2 exactly. And, if he deserts her and takes everything, 3 that's okay because it was his, not hers, when it was 4 really hers. 5 So, those types of very simple connections with family and what was legal is incredibly different 6 7 to think about today. And, I think maybe that is part of what we 8 9 all need to think about, which is, any time multiple 10 decades goes by and you're working for progress, 11 you're impacted by the newness of each of the new 12 decades. 13 And, what we should be doing is thinking, 14 we are much more wise today. I am much more wise 15 today than I was 1ten years ago, than I was twenty 16 years ago, et cetera. 17 I should be using that viewpoint then to 18 the world in а more complete way, 19 definitely. And, part of it is just to say, history 20 is still -- we are still thinking differently and 21 learning things about history, but even so, these are 22 similar issues that we have today. 23 And, everyone should think about it moving forward as well. So, not just what it was, what we 24

didn't have, but what we are today and what we still

1	need to get. I think it's that longer time frame or
2	view that I think is incredibly important.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Lovely.
4	With that, I will thank both of you for
5	taking your time and sharing your expertise with us
6	today.
7	We are we do have some more items to
8	complete for our business today, but let's take a five
9	minute break so we can take a moment to have a
10	photograph with our panelists if they will before they
11	leave us.
12	And then, we'll come back in five minutes
13	to complete our business meeting.
14	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
15	off the record at 12:05 p.m.)
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, I'm going to return
17	us to our record. We will next return to our agenda
18	items. And next in it is to consider a statement
19	about the White House's budget request for Fiscal Year
20	'19.
21	C. STATEMENT ABOUT THE WHITE HOUSE'S BUDGET
22	REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR '19
23	CHAIR LHAMON: I'm going to start us, even
24	though Commissioner Adegbile hasn't yet returned. He
25	is recused from this statement.

I'll first read the statement that we will consider, and that is" "The Members of the U.S. Commission on civil Rights are dismayed that the administrations proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2019 again drastically cuts civil rights enforcement across key federal agencies.

The Commission urges Congress instead to prioritize federal civil rights enforcement resources.

Available data reflects growing need for federal enforcement of civil rights.

Yet the White House not only fails to seek increases in funding for its Agency civil rights enforcement work, it instead proposes dramatic cuts in funding and personnel and to reduce the federal role, even in serving as the critical backstop against harm to vulnerable Americans.

For example, the Department of Education touts limiting the federal role in education as a highlight of its budget proposal.

Despite reports of an increase of racial hate crimes, the administration harassment and proposes to eliminate 27 additional positions in the Department of Justice's civil rights division, 23 investigative positions in the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, and 75 positions

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs in the Department of Labor.

The Administration's budget request proposes to slash the budget of the Office for Civil Rights at the Department of Health and Human Services by 20 percent -- \$8 million below its budget for the last two years.

None of the White Houses proposed budget increases is directed at increasing civil rights where Congress enforcement. Even Administrations proposed to civil cuts enforcement last year and provided for an increase in such funding, the white house now seeks \$1.1 million funding, when less even Congress appropriated specifically for that purpose in the current fiscal year.

Likewise, the Department of Health and Human Services projects an increase in civil rights complaint receipts in the coming year.

But the Administration proposes not only significantly decreasing its budget, but also compounding its workload through creation of its new conscious and Religious Freedom Division, within out addressing how this divisions budget and staffing will impact the Office for Civil Rights ability to carry

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

out the other critical portions of its mandate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The White House budget also proposes to zero out the budget of the Department of Justice's Community Relations Service and transfer its functions to the civil rights division. That transfer would further reduce the functional budget of the Civil Rights Division.

Which then Administration already proposes to cut by 27 people. By adding to its workload without funding that work.

A further concern, CRS provides critical services the budget, its request, as acknowledges, to assist communities with preventing resolving tensions and violence related to discrimination, Including violent hate committed 'on the basis of actual or perceived race, national origin, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion or disability.'

An essential function of CRS is to act as a mediating presence in communities experiencing conflict, combining its functions with the civil rights divisions which investigates and prosecutes offenders of civil rights laws, could harm the effective function of CRS.

In addition, the Administration's budget

request proposes to cut nearly \$3 million from the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Fair Housing initiatives, programs, education and outreach initiative.

This program is part of HUD's efforts to provide fair housing enforcement and education across the country, funds critical efforts to inform the public on the rights, responsibilities, remedies and resources available under the Fair Housing Act. The dollars lost in this program, nearly a third of what was allocated the last two years, could have a devastating impact.

Recent news reports that the Department is considering removing the language in its mission statement that HUD is "to build inclusive and sustainable communities free from discrimination" compound the commissions concern regarding reducing funding specific to fair housing.

Secretary Carson promises that HUD will continue its legal and rightful role in protecting Americans from housing discrimination whether or not the mission statement includes that commitment. However, removing the formal commitment to nondiscrimination, while also proposing to reduce funds, signals a retreat from the equity mission of

the agency harming communities around the country, who depend on HUD, to ensure they are not subject to discriminatory and unequal access to housing.

These failure proposed cuts and to prioritize civil rights enforcement reflect dangerous departure from the federal role in protecting core rights to which this nation committed and re-committed itself over the years.

Last June, the Commission unanimously approved a comprehensive two year assessment of federal rights enforcement, which will conclude in Fiscal Year 2019.

The ongoing review examines the degree to which current budgets and staffing levels allow civil rights offices to perform their statutory and regulatory functions, the management practices in place in the offices and whether these practices are sufficient to meet the volume of civil rights issues within the office's jurisdiction, and the efficacy of recent civil rights enforcement efforts from the offices that our assessment is ongoing and our final report will not issue until the close of Fiscal year 2019.

The Administrations second budget proposal

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	is, as its first one was, deeply alarming. Chair
2	Catherine E. Lhamon states, 'the Commission urges
3	Congress to reject this Administration's retreat on
4	civil rights and instead to appropriate funds at the
5	level necessary to ensure effective enforcement of
6	federal civil rights so that we might all live the
7	promise of the justice and equality for all.Congress,
8	and this Administration, if it were appropriately
9	focused on fair representation of all Americans, could
10	balance all American interests to ensure equity and
11	fairness through the budget. We can now discuss the
12	statement.
13	To open the floor for discussion, I move
14	that we approve the statement. Is there a second?
15	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: I'll second.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any discussion
17	on this statement?
18	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes, Madam
19	Chair, I would wonder, I mean, I wonder if you would
20	consider, in the title, I would propose that the U.S.
21	Commission on civil rights urges Congress to
22	prioritize civil rights in the Fiscal Year 2019
23	budget. As opposed to what's currently written.
24	CHAIRMAN LHAMON: I accept that proposal.
25	Thank you. I think it's an improvement over what I

1	had.
2	Any other discussion on this statement?
3	Okay. Oh, Commissioner Heriot.
4	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Thank you. I just
5	want to say that I intend to vote no on this motion.
6	For example, the Department of Education, it states
7	that the Department of Education touts limiting the
8	federal role on education as a highlight of its budget
9	proposal.
10	I support that and I think that a lot of
11	Americans do. I note that these civil rights
12	divisions budget has in fact been modestly, the
13	proposal is to modestly increase it, although it does
14	bring in issues that weren't previously before the
15	civil rights division.
16	And so I could go on here but I have a
17	feeling I'm going to lose this vote too so why don't
18	we just get on with it.
19	(Laughter)
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Thank you. Any
21	other discussion?
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Kirsanow.
23	CHAIRMAN LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow.
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thanks very much.
25	Just would note that expenditures of funds doesn't

1	necessarily equate to efficacy.
2	The amount of funds apparently expended on
3	"civil rights enforcement under the Obama
4	Administration went up significantly, admittedly."
5	But there are a number of studies, including by
6	Indiana University of Law School, that showed that
7	despite that fact, the number of enforcement actions
8	taken by the Obama Justice Department, in areas such
9	as education, housing and employment, were down. And
10	in some cases, significantly down, from a similar
11	period under the Bush Administration.
12	So I think money is nice but money isn't
13	the be all and end all. And I would also note my
14	perplex, being perplexed that only 75 positions are
15	being eliminated from the Office of Federal Contract
16	Compliance Programs.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Meaning you would have
18	expected more to be eliminated? Commissioner
19	Kirsanow, did we lose you?
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm sorry, I
21	didn't hear that?
22	CHAIRMAN LHAMON: So I was asking, did you
23	expect that there would be more eliminated or I didn't
24	understand what you were perplexed about I guess.
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: I see. Thank you. I will
2	say I share your view, that the budget is far from
3	tell, the whole story, and that it's important to
4	examine how the budget, how the dollars are used and
5	how effectively the dollars are used.
6	And that there are good questions to be
7	asked about whether more dollars are spent wisely and
8	whether less dollars can be spent efficiently. So I
9	wholeheartedly share that view and think that is worth
10	examining, and I look forward to our ongoing
11	examination of that, over the next year.
12	And I think that it is hard to imagine
13	doing civil rights work effectively, in these
14	agencies, with the cuts that are being proposed. And
15	so I think it's also important to say the concern
16	about budgets that are more sufficient then this
17	proposal allows.
18	If there is no further discussion I'll
19	call a roll call vote. My understanding, Commissioner
20	Adegbile, is that you are recused, is that correct?
21	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Correct.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Commissioner Heriot,
23	how do you vote?
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote no.
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: See, this is a
4	problem. You have two no's right in front of me so of
5	course that confuses me. Yes.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: As contrary as you, I think
7	it would give you clear direction, Commissioner Yaki.
8	(Laughter)
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Vice Chair
10	Timmons-Goodson?
11	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: And I'll vote yes. The
13	motion passes. Two Commissioners voted no, one
14	Commissioner is recused and all others were in favor.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And I think
16	Commissioner Kirsanow was using a mind meld on me on
17	the other wote.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Definitely. I'm certain
19	that's what it was. Commissioner Yaki, I think we
20	have
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: a statement from you to
23	look at next.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. Actually, I'd
25	say letter, that should build upon the statement that

we issued earlier.

This is regarding immigration enforcement actions in court houses. It's a letter from the Commission to Thomas Homan, the deputy director and senior official performing the duties for the director of ICE.

D. LETTER FROM COMMISSION TO THOMAS HOMAN REGARDING IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS IN COURT HOUSES

COMMISSIONER YAKI: "Dear deputy director Homan, the undersigned numbers of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, writes to express our continuing concern with U.S. Immigration and Customs Protection enforcement policy allowing immigration enforcement actions inside court houses and its dangerous consequences that undermine our judicial system.

The Commission previously issued a majority approved statement raising concern that conducting immigration enforcement actions inside courthouses instill needless additional fear of anxiety within immigrant communities, discourages interacting with the judicial system and endangers the safety of entire communities. We've attached our statement to your consideration.

ICEs recent guidance on when and how we'll conduct civil immigration enforcement actions in courthouses, is a step in the right direction but falls short of ensuring the fair administration of justice and the safety of communities.

Specifically, ICE's policy does not consider courthouses sensitive locations, such as it has for schools, hospital or places of worship where ICE will conduct immigration enforcement actions in limited circumstances, such as exigent circumstances, but will generally be avoided.

The failure to contract courthouses in sensitive places is perplexing, but ICE's sensitive location policy is meant to enhance the public understanding the trust and to ensure that the people seeking to participate in activities or to utilize services provided at any sensitive location are free to do so, without fear or hesitation.

The failure to exclude courthouses from ICE's enforcement action achieves exactly the opposite effect and prevents victims of violent crime, domestic abuse and work exploitation from seeking justice. The policy unnecessarily increases the disruptive presence of ICE's agents in courthouses, instilling fear of mistrust of our injustice system among immigrant

1 invulnerable communities when such enforcement actions could be conducted elsewhere with less harmful impact. 2 immigrants 3 Moreover, such as 4 members friends accompanying the targeted immigrant 5 community may still be arrested on a case-by-case Finally, the policy does not apply only to 6 7 criminal immigration enforcement actions and does not distinguished which immigrants 8 further be 9 targeted for criminal enforcement actions 10 independent bipartisan As 11 the President charged with advising and 12 Congress civil rights matters the and 13 the Commission strongly administration of justice, urges ICE to reconsider its guidance on courthouse 14 15 courthouses and classified at sensitive 16 Thank you for your consideration, we look locations. 17 forward to your responses, hugs and kisses, the 18 Commission. 19 (Laughter) 20 The hugs and kisses were of CHAIR LHAMON: 21 course hyperbole but --22 (Laughter) 23 CHAIR LHAMON: So do we have a motion so 24 we can open the floor for discussion? 25 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: So moved.

1 CHAIR LHAMON: And do we have a second? 2 I'll second it. Do we have any discussion on this 3 letter? Hearing none --4 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Kirsanow here. 5 CHAIR LHAMON: Oh, Commissioner Kirsanow. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: 6 Yes. Bov, I'm 7 almost inclined to sign on just based on the fact I'd like to sign on to something that ends with hugs 8 9 kisses. 10 (Laughter) COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: 11 But, aside from 12 that, just three observations. First, I just note 13 that absent from the letters, any evidence of 14 ICE that falls action taken within by our 15 jurisdiction. 16 There is no evidence, at least educed in 17 this letter, or shown to have been educed in this 18 letter by the Commission that the ICE's courthouse 19 enforcement efforts discriminate or deny 20 protection on the basis of race, color, sex or any 21 other protected class. 22 And also, as we do with other letters, 23 several of us have made the point that it might be 24 advisable to defer to the expertise of the relevant

In this case, the experience and expertise of

agency.

1	ICE and what constitutes a "sensitive location for
2	purposes of effective immigration enforcement."
3	And also, courthouses are not considered
4	sensitive locations insulating American citizens or
5	lawful residents from arrest if they're otherwise in
6	violation of the law when they entered a courthouse.
7	So we're treating, here in this letter, illegal
8	immigrants in a more elevated or protective status
9	then that enjoyed by American citizens when it comes
10	to inflation from courthouse arrest.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Commissioner
12	Kirsanow. We do of course have jurisdiction over
13	administration of justice and the access to
14	courthouses is core within our jurisdiction. I don't
15	know if others have other questions about the
16	responses. Okay.
17	I'll call the question, take a roll call
18	vote. Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
19	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote no.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I with hugs.
1	1

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson?
2	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes with hugs as
4	well.
5	(Laughter)
6	CHAIR LHAMON: The vote, the motion
7	passes. Two Commissioners voted no, no Commissioner
8	abstained and all those were in favor.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But there is not a
10	majority in favor of hugs which I'm very disheartened
11	to see.
12	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I bet you could get
13	the majority on hugs and kisses, it's the letter
14	that's the problem.
15	(Laughter)
16	CHAIR LHAMON: We'll have to add that to
17	our next agenda, since that's not an agenda item. But
18	I'm sure we would be unanimously in favor of
19	expressing love.
20	Next, we're turning to management and
21	operations.
22	E. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS
23	CHAIR LHAMON: We'll hear from the Staff
24	Director Mauro Morales, for our monthly staff
25	director's report.

1 MR. MORALES: Thank you, Madam Chair. 2 the interest of time I thank you, and of course in the interest of time I have nothing further to add beyond 3 4 what is already contained in the report. 5 I'm always available to discuss any matter with a Commissioner and if they see anything in the 6 7 report they would like to get more information on. However, I would like to take a moment to 8 9 recognize the service of our spring interims. 10 which are still seated here in our audience. 11 them just stepped out. 12 Shimang Zhang, she is a law clerk to the 13 currently assistants and supervised who should have additional 14 Commissioner Kladney, 15 interns coming in over the summer. 16 also have Krista Painter. Please stand 17 shake to say hello and waive. She's at the 18 of Texas and she's currently with OCRE University 19 [Office of Civil Rights Evaluation]. 20 And we also have Elizabeth Boyle. She's 21 an undergrad at the University of Notre Dame. 22 stand up. 23 Thank you, ladies, so much, for coming and 24 for helping in providing the research that you've 25 It's extraordinarily important to what we do

1 here and we thank you. 2 And we hope your learning and have, when you go back to your institutions you'll have some 3 4 additional knowledge that will help you in your 5 career, so thank you very much. CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. 6 7 We also have two that are MR. MORALES: Laura Gevarter, she's with OCRE. 8 not here. 9 have, I know I'm going to mispronounce this name, but 10 we have Qiuxu Li. She's with the Office of General 11 Council. 12 And Ms. Zhang has just joined us. Just 13 waive at the Commissioners. Again, thank you. 14 expect to have an additional number of interns this 15 summer and we'll recognize them as they come in. 16 of you, thank you so much. 17 the fact that you're all women during Women's History 18 Month is amazing, so thank you for coming 19 participating and learning about civil rights and 20 being, hopefully someday, practice wherever 21 careers take you and you'll always recognize the 22 importance of civil rights. So thank you very much. 23 And with that, Madam Chair, I have nothing further. 24 25 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Mr. Staff

1	Director. I also do want to add my thanks to our
2	staff for their insistence in setting up today's
3	presentations and making this meeting, as all
4	meetings, run as smoothly as possible. Very, very
5	grateful for it, so thank you.
6	And with that, I adjourn our meeting at
7	12:29 Eastern Time. Thank you all.
8	III. ADJOURN MEETING
9	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
10	off the record at 12:29 p.m.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	